

JPRS-UPA-88-029  
2 AUGUST 1988



FOREIGN  
BROADCAST  
INFORMATION  
SERVICE

# ***JPRS Report***

## **Soviet Union**

---

***Political Affairs***

# Soviet Union

## Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-88-029

### CONTENTS

2 AUGUST 1988

#### PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

Tajik CC Plenum Resolution on Role of Basic Party Organizations in Perestroyka  
*[Unattributed report; KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA, 29 May 88]* ..... 1

#### MEDIA, PROPAGANDA

Kazakhstanskaya Pravda Editor on Glasnost in Media  
*[F. Ignatov; KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 27 Apr 87]* ..... 4

#### HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY

Notion of Georgians' Favored Status Under Stalin Debunked  
*[E. Shengelaya; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 18 Jun 88]* ..... 8

#### RELIGION

Kazakhstan Council for Religious Affairs Official Answers Readers' Questions  
*[A.I. Artemyev; AGROPROMYSHLENNYY KOMPLEKS KAZAKHSTANA No 4, Apr 88]* ..... 11

Metropolitan Filaret on Christianization of Kievan Rus  
*[N. Matukovskiy; NEDELYA No 18, 2-8 May 88]* ..... 14

Metropolitan Vladimir Refutes Congressional Resolution  
*[Unattributed report; IZVESTIYA, 27 May 88]* ..... 16

#### CULTURE

Scholar Blasts Zhdanov Attacks on Leading Cultural Figures  
*[V.V. Ivanov; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 1 Jun 88]* ..... 18

Writer Bykov on 'Anti-Perestroyka Forces' in Belorussian Culture  
*[V. Bykov; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 11 Jun 88]* ..... 22

Writers' Union Chief Karpov Addresses Supreme Soviet  
*[V.V. Karpov; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 1 Jun 88]* ..... 26

Uzbek Film Scored For Sympathetic View of Stalin  
*[R. Pospelov; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 1 Jun 88]* ..... 28

#### SOCIAL ISSUES

USSR Procuracy Sets New Tasks in Restructuring  
*[Unattributed report; SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA ZAKONNOST, No 4, Apr 88]* ..... 31

Readers View Law on Appealing Unlawful Official Actions  
*[A. Kuznetsov; SOVETSKAYA YUSTITSIYA, No 9, May 88]* ..... 34

Archivist Urges Legal Regulation of State Documents  
*[A.I. Chugunov, R. Armelev; IZVESTIYA, 2 Jun 88]* ..... 37

MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA Views 'Democratic Union'  
*[Yu. Shabanov; MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, 14 May 88]* ..... 39

'Pamyat' Members Speak Out on Their Organization, Its Aims  
*[T. Sergeyeva; MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, 19 May 88]* ..... 42

Jurists Discuss Legal Means To Fight Rising Moonshine Production  
*[R. Brize, V. Gordeyev; SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA ZAKONNOST, No 4, Apr 88]* ..... 45

#### REGIONAL ISSUES

Latvia Issues Regulations for Demonstrations, Public Meetings  
*[SOVETSKAYA LATVIA, 28 May 88]* ... 48

Latvian Plenum Participants Discuss Nationalities Issues  
*[LATINFORM; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 8 May 88]* ..... 49



**Tajik CC Plenum Resolution on Role of Basic Party Organizations in Perestroyka**  
18300288 Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA in Russian 29 May 88 p 2

[Decree of the 10th Plenum of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee, 21 May 1988. Report of the Ordzhonikidzeabad Gorkom Concerning Work To Enhance the Role of the Primary Party Organizations in Implementing Perestroyka]

[Text] Having heard and discussed the report of the Ordzhonikidzeabad Gorkom concerning work to enhance the role of the primary party organizations in implementing perestroyka, the plenum of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee notes that perestroyka, which was launched by the April 1985 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and the 27th Party Congress, is encompassing increasingly broader aspects of the economic, social-political, and spiritual life of the city and the rayon. The climate in the labor collectives and the people's attitude toward their work are improving. People are increasingly intolerant of laxity, mismanagement, and incompetent leadership; there is stronger orientation toward end results.

The labor collectives are introducing new forms of organization of labor. More than 1000 family links have been created in the rayon agroindustrial complex, and 56 percent of the industrial enterprises have been converted to full cost-accounting and self-financing. The city's and rayon's economy is developing at an ever-increasing pace. In 2 years the volume of industrial production has grown by 25.3 percent and labor productivity in industry has risen by 22 percent, which is substantially higher than the targets of the five-year plan.

Nevertheless, the Ordzhonikidzeabad Gorkom has not yet managed to substantially renovate the forms and methods of the work of the gorkom, its buro and apparatus, or to exert a noticeable influence on improving the efforts of the primary party organizations. Their practical actions lack concreteness and persistence. The lower-level links and the immediate labor collectives have not yet become the center of all party work.

Many party organizations have not determined their role in developing democracy and implementing economic reform. In the 2 years the industrial enterprises have fallen 1.3 million rubles short of fulfilling contractual delivery obligations, and builders have fallen 6.6 million rubles short in the completion of fixed assets. In the 2 years the rayon's farms have failed to deliver 1624 tons of meat, 3.2 million eggs, and 618 tons of grapes. There is no precise, thoroughly worked out program to resolve the housing problem, which is an extremely acute one for the city and the rayon.

The gorkom has failed to overcome the lag of a number of buros and party committees behind the dynamic development of vital processes. Instead of organizing

work with people and getting to the bottom of contemporary problems, they have continued to be in thrall to old methods which have not proved themselves, methods based on form rather than content. For this reason, perestroyka has failed to penetrate deeply into the activities of the party organizations. Frequently, party meetings are conducted in a meaningless manner, with low attendance and few party members taking part, being reduced to general conversations and having no significant influence on the life of the labor collectives and the handling of concrete tasks and problems. No strict monitoring has been established over the practical execution of decrees and plans that have been adopted. The reports by secretaries of the party committees and party buros at the gorkom buro have failed to serve as a school for enhancing the fighting spirit of the party organizations.

Improvements in the structure of the city party organization are proceeding very slowly; very little practical work has been done to place communists in crucial sectors of production, especially on the sovkhozes and kolkhozes. The creation of brigades on contract and family links in the agrarian sector is proceeding chaotically, without the active influence of party organizations and monitoring on the part of the gorkom.

No substantial positive changes have taken place in the practice of selecting for party membership. This work is not always closely tied in with concrete tasks of perestroyka and the necessity of strengthening party influence in the most important sectors of the struggle to implement radical economic reform and democratize social life. The party organizations have failed to do away with the formalistic-statistical approach to the regulation of the growth of party ranks; there have been cases in which people who were not prepared have been accepted into the party.

Many primary party organizations are failing to make full use of democratic principles in cadre work. In the past 2 years, 120 nomenklatura workers have been replaced, but only eight persons have been elected on a competitive basis.

The primary party organizations have failed to implement genuine perestroyka in ideological and mass-political work. There is a great deal of formalism in the organization of political and economic instruction. The perestroyka of the activities of the editors of the rayon newspaper KOMMUNA is proceeding slowly.

The secretaries of the Ordzhonikidzeabad Gorkom have failed to mobilize the apparatus to enhance the fighting spirit of the primary party organizations in the period when perestroyka has entered a new stage of practical action. Apparatus officials continue to dissipate their efforts on preparations for various measures and waste time copying the decrees of higher organs, so that they do not have enough time to visit the party organizations and help them; frequently they fail to complete what they

have started. The activities of the gorkom lack the differentiated approach to work with party collectives; its approach is identical with regard to industrial and agricultural institutions as well as small-scale organizations. A very minor role is played by the shop party organizations and groups, and party organizers are slack in their efforts. Insufficient attention is being paid to the matter of good-quality instruction for party organization secretaries and raising their responsibility for the state of affairs in the collectives.

The Tajik Communist Party Central Committee Plenum hereby **decrees**:

1. It is to be noted that despite certain positive tendencies, the Ordzhonikidzeabad Gorkom has failed to exert any substantial influence on enhancing the role of the primary party organizations in implementing perestroika. This is one result of the fact that the gorkom's buro and apparatus are modifying their work style much too slowly, preferring the old, outmoded forms and methods to new ones.

The buro of the Ordzhonikidzeabad Gorkom is directed to raise the level of the work with the primary party organizations, making it the center of gravity of all organizational and political work. Efforts are to be made to exert active influence by the primary party organizations on all aspects of economic and cultural development. The main criterion for assessing the performance of the party organizations should be their participation in perestroika, genuine progress toward improvement, and tangible results in economic, social, and spiritual spheres.

2. In order to ensure further development of the democratization of social life, the Ordzhonikidzeabad Gorkom is to enhance in every way the role of the elective organs, the primary party organizations, and all their members in the handling of problems which arise, in formulating and implementing decisions and monitoring their execution. The gorkom is to improve the deployment of party members, enhance their vanguard role in every way, and make full use of their initiative and independence in order that their experience and personal example can, as an end result, serve to enlist the whole labor collective more energetically in the process of perestroika. With this purpose in mind, it is recommended that party members in the primary organizations go through social-political certification.

Work on selection for party membership must be linked to the concrete tasks of perestroika and the necessity of strengthening party influence in the most vital sectors of the struggle to implement radical economic reform and democratization of social life.

Further measures must be taken to expand glasnost and develop business-like criticism and self-criticism and the broad exchange of opinions. It is essential to react in a timely fashion to proposals and remarks made by party

members at gorkom plenums and party aktivs and meetings of primary party organizations, and to hold people strictly accountable for any persecution or suppression of criticism, up to and including expulsion from the party.

3. The gorkom must structure its work in a differentiated manner with the different categories of primary party organizations. It must see to it that the party committees and buros continually strive to master political methods of leadership, and it must create the conditions for enhancing the role and responsibility of the party aktiv and every party member in resolving the tasks of perestroika.

The gorkom must help party collectives to master the concrete methods of party influence on the management of the economy during the transition to full cost-accounting, self-financing, and self-payback. It must set up schools of advanced experience in party work on the base of the best party organizations, using them as an example to teach the secretaries of party organization and the party aktiv how to act under conditions of democratization and the transition to new forms of management.

4. The gorkom is to orient the primary party organizations toward further expansion of democratic principles in cadre work. It must conduct more vigorous, public work with reserves in order to detect persons who are capable of ensuring the implementation of the tasks of perestroika and acceleration. It must afford more independence in dealing with cadre problems and reduce the strength of the gorkom buro's nomenklatura by reducing the duties of economic officials.

Fuller use must be made of the right of comprehensive and day-to-day monitoring of the activities of the administration and the work of the apparatus. Careful efforts must be made to keep abreast of the lines of activity of the commissions and their staffs, manned by party members capable of genuinely waging uncompromising battle against existing shortcomings and oversights.

The practice of party supervision of ideological support for the economic mechanism requires radical perestroika. In connection with this, it is essential to expand the practice of individual work with people and get all party members involved in it. Vigorous efforts must be made against survivals of the past, against all forms of negative manifestations. Better solutions must be found to problems of the social restructuring of rural districts and the strengthening of the material base of cultural and sports institutions. Constant efforts must be made to educate the working people in the spirit of the brotherly friendship of the peoples of the USSR, Soviet patriotism, and socialist internationalism.

The quality and effectiveness of the political and economic instruction of party members must be enhanced under the new conditions.

5. The gorkom must analyze the work of the primary party organizations more thoroughly, from the standpoint of perestroika, and provide timely practical aid. It must establish firm order so that every apparatus worker spends the bulk of his work time in the primary party organizations as an advisor and helper. Special attention must be focused on the small-strength party organizations and low-level party links. In order to strengthen party influence, the structure of the party organizations must be brought into line with that of production. Party organizers must be assigned to labor collectives which do not include party members.

Measures must be implemented to further enhance the rank and authority of the secretaries and members of party committees and party bureos of the primary party organizations. During the period of preparing and conducting the 1988 report and election campaign, a study must be made of the opinions of party members and

non-members concerning the candidacies of secretaries of party organizations and other members of elective organs who meet: the requirements of perestroika. It is essential that party collectives be headed by the most authoritative and respected party members who are genuinely in favor of perestroika.

6. Obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms of the Tajik Communist Party must master political methods of leadership more vigorously, enhance the role of the primary party organizations in carrying out perestroika, and see to it that they constitute the real political nucleus of the labor collective, take an active, principled position when dealing with any problem of production, social, and intellectual spheres, and more boldly implement the party line toward perestroika.

06854

**Kazakhstanskaya Pravda Editor on Glasnost in Media**  
18300247 Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA  
in Russian 27 Apr 88 p 3

[Interview with F. Ignatov, editor of KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, by a reader, Aleksey Georgiyevich, date and place not specified: "Take More Upon Oneself"]

[Text] [Question] The years of stagnation (and—by historical analogy—of reaction) have brought the state and society to the brink of a crisis, to which perestroika has now been set in opposition. What is the role of the mass information media, and of KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA in particular, in the apologia of those stagnant years?

[Answer] If we confuse concepts, then there will not be any intelligent conversation. Stagnation is the absence of development; it is a stoppage in any area of life or activity. Reaction, however, in the mildest definition—is any opposition to the development of that which is new and advanced. To be stopped in development and to consciously oppose development, you will agree, are very different things.

And one more point. The years did not "stagnate" by themselves. Each of us is to blame in this matter. Some more so, some less so, but everyone carries some blame. And everyone must consider his own blame. Unless we acknowledge old mistakes, we will never avoid new ones.

About the press. Was it, and KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA in particular, engaged in defending and praising, or, as you put it, in providing an apologia of the stagnant years?

Of course, the press was not engaged in defending and praising the actual phenomenon of stagnation. But it did help to create a mood of complacency when it crowded with immoderate loudness about even the most insignificant achievements. It lulled public opinion and instilled indifference when it was silent about the phenomena which are now being condemned. There were too many forbidden zones for criticism in the press, although the editor's mailbag overflowed with letters about unfairness in the distribution of housing, about the growth of alcoholism and prostitution, about empty food shops and other stores lacking goods, about bribery and favoritism.

The newspapers were not silent on this. Sober words about major shortcomings in the economy, ideology and other spheres of life made their way onto their pages. Journalists, as well as people with a high sense of civil obligation—our authors, were fighting as far as they were able for the need for change in society. Measures were

taken on the basis of the complaints: as a rule, authors of unwelcome statements were passified. And all too infrequently was anything done to eradicate the inadequacies named by the press.

Now there is incomparably more criticism—well reasoned, considered and constructive—in the press and on television and radio. The reasons for past mistakes are being analyzed. There is a conversation going on about the inadequacies of today because perestroika is already casting its own shadows.

And again some people, as was noted in a PRAVDA editorial for 6 April of the current year, are prepared to see all the problems and all the unpleasantness of the current life in the fact that the newspapers "have gotten out of hand, that they are judging everything, disturbing public opinion," etc. "It is necessary to recognize that a newspaper page is a secondary phenomenon. The primary one exists in life itself! In order not to read about inadequacies on the page of a newspaper—they must be absent from life," as the print organ of the CPSU Central Committee has reminded us all.

A newspaper which does not reflect all the joys and all the problems of life is dead. If a newspaper creates an instantaneous synthesis of all the vital phenomena, if it raises them to the acute stage of question formulation or crystallizes experience so essential to the people, then it becomes a fighter and a helper of the party and the people in the difficult struggle for the restructuring of society along truly communist lines.

What kind of life and press we have depends entirely on each of us.

[Question] Party leadership of the press is indisputable. However, recently the newspaper has reported instances of "telephonic" editing not only at the rayon level but also at the republic and union levels. What is the situation with regard to "instructions from above"? And is there not a contradiction here?

[Answer] Those who were "correcting", those who were trying to function through "telephonic" methods, which included not only "telephonic" editing, have themselves been corrected and firmly. The CPSU Central Committee resolutions on this score are well known. PRAVDA, IZVESTIYA and other newspapers have spoken out in defense of those whom they have tried to deflect from criticism and the formulation of difficult questions. KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA has spoken out and continues to speak out. Virtually all the statements are being followed up with effective measures.

Is the pressure method of press leadership continuing? I will not hide the fact that such things still happen. But a majority of party committees are aware of the futility of such actions.

[Question] What is the situation with regard to "instructions from above," and are there not contradictions in the leadership of the press?

[Answer] The editorial boards have been granted broad rights in the selection of topics. There are virtually no forbidden zones remaining for critical statements by the press. A journalist draws his own conclusions from what he has seen and heard, and he draws them without prompting from above. This represents confidence in the journalist as well as a test of his political and civil maturity and of his competence. The journalist's responsibility for each and every word has increased immeasurably. There is no one to dump on now: he cannot say that his material "ran into problems up above." If he has failed to sort something out, if he has slandered an honest person, if he has been unscrupulous, he answers for himself.

And if a journalist gets carried away, if he utilizes the press for such selfish purposes as settling old scores? Is he forgiven after references to glasnost and democracy are made? Nothing of the sort. No one is permitted to use a party platform to satisfy ambitious pretensions. And in such a case a party committee must not fail to correct a newspaper where such material has appeared.

Write the truth, the truth and once again the truth, evaluate facts and phenomena objectively—those are the "instructions from above" which newspapermen are receiving. And these instructions in no way depart from the Leninist principles of leadership of the press.

[Question] Why are the editorials in the newspaper still unsigned? And there are still very few articles by the top leaders of the republic—by members of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee, the Council of Ministers and the Supreme Soviet?

[Answer] A few words about editorials.

An unsigned editorial expresses the position of the editorial board in general; it contains an evaluation of facts and phenomena; it provides a directive from those whose print organ the newspaper is; and it prompts the party and professional organizations, as well as soviet and economic organs, to address the best experience and direction in the resolution of any given problems.

A signed article put in place of an editorial, as a rule, raises the most topical issues of the day and draws the attention of public opinion to them. An editorial with a signature contains reflections, conclusions and suggestions made by a specific person and should be treated as the opinion of that and only that person.

The newspaper is prepared to publish more signed editorials. There is one condition which authors must meet: the questions being raised must be topical and the suggestions must be constructive.

You, Aleksey Georgiyevich, have noted correctly that statements by the republic's leaders still appear in the newspaper extremely infrequently. Journalists also posed this question at a recent meeting with members of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee Buro and heard an encouraging reply from the leaders of the republic. You probably know that S.K. Kubashev, the second secretary of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee, appeared on television a few days ago.

[Question] Does your editorial collective have bureaucrats, officials, fellow travelers, compromisers, etc. or is it all "like-mindedness?"

[Answer] I would not begin to impart negative connotations to the word "like-mindedness." In a creative collective, if it is not burdened with dogmas, if it is striving to say something useful at a time of the most conflicting judgements of any given fact or any phenomenon, situations are frequently created in which the various thoughts of the various people who work in the editorial office, as well as the diversity of the nuances, shades and casts of their opinions create and crystallize one idea, tested by the collective efforts; they nourish the main idea which the newspaper defends and implements.

We do not think that what the newspaper has said is always and absolutely the truth to the last instance. But this truth is frequently worked out through the clash of opinions, through conflicts and disagreements. And the actual truth of any given position is not proved abstractly but rather on the basis of quite definite examples and facts.

Thus the editorial workers are by no means obliged to think the same way but they must be companions-in-arms.

The thoughts expressed in letters from readers and their responses to any given material published in the newspaper also help us to choose the course which we follow.

In each of us there is probably a bit of the bureaucrat and a bit of the official, and he who has less of these qualities is needed in this time of the revolutionary renewal of society. We are beating out of ourselves everything superficial, we are washing away the accumulated moss. If he has not removed the scab from the soul, if he has not uncovered the nerve, does a newspaperman have the right to enter into open conversation with an audience of many thousands?

[Question] "Cooked" facts, sensational as well as salacious stories have appeared fleetingly on the pages of many publications. KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA is a pleasant exception here. Here one has solidity, authority or is it "caution"?

[Answer] If the exception is pleasant, then why talk about caution? In this case, it is clear, the conversation should be not so much about the caution or the solidity and authority of a publication as about party consistency and about simple human reasonableness with regard to the publication of "cooked" facts, sensational reports or salacious stories.

Publishing salacious stories on the pages of a newspaper is not, in my opinion, the job of the Soviet press. Moreover, in many years of work in journalism I do not recall a single letter with a request to entertain the reader with scabrous material. In truth I have not encountered in recent times a blatantly salacious story in serious newspapers which respect themselves and their readers. In magazines—yes, and, alas, they even print unprintable expressions. But this has no relation to journalism (with one exception—in the press it is absolutely necessary to criticize dissoluteness of thought and word, especially the written word).

With regard to sensational stories. They are as necessary to a newspaper as air. But there should be sensational stories when the event itself and the report about it are truly stunning. The first atomic icebreaker and the first artificial satellite of the Earth, the first launching of a man into space, the discovery of a new star and the long-distance anesthetization, performed by Anatolii Kashpirovskiy during an operation using a telecommunications channel—these are truly sensational stories. Good and inspiring.

Air, marine and railway disasters, mud and snow avalanches which bury entire villages also stun. Are they sensations? Probably. But primarily they are great human tragedies which cause permanent human grief. And it is entirely a matter of how the newspaper describes the event and of what kinds of feelings it will arouse in the reader.

It is possible that some people are interested in stories about three-horned bulls, two-headed snakes, green strangers from other planets which stubbornly evade the camera and unidentified flying objects. These stories are not harmful, nor are they useful. And for this reason they seem to represent an unhealthy pursuit of popularity by a publication.

It is incomparably worse when newspapers and magazines rashly—without sufficient knowledge and documentary grounding—judge complex, crucial periods in the development of our country and the role of any given party and state leader. And it must be remembered that the word "document" is Latin in origin and means an instructive example, based on proof. When personal passions gain the upper hand over reasoning and over the truth of life, the openness and criticism of the present days are used by authors and publications to knock together doubtful moral capital—such sensational stories have a greater resemblance to speculation in the

trust of the reader starved for the truth. The irresponsibility of authors and publishers has already led to situations in which Lenin's thoughts and judgements which he expressed to one or another contemporary are being distorted; they are being passed off as one's own sentiments. I would dare to assert that this group of authors is comprised of those who both in recent years and now think one thing, say a second and do a third. They are like foam on the wave of perestroika. But it is not foam but the wave itself which turns the turbines and carries the ship. Publications which attach themselves to perestroika and which utilize democratization and glasnost for their personal advantage only deflect us from the resolution of the very complex tasks of renewing society; they try to lead us away from the true path. They efface the truth of life. But the truth is one. And it is not on their side.

About "cooked" facts. Before our very eyes this concept is leaving the vocabulary of journalists. Glasnost has opened up such dramatic facts and phenomena in our life that no dramatization of them is necessary. And we are now concerned that we do not slip into "licking around" these facts and phenomena. Taking aim at individual negative facts is simple. It is much more complicated to discover the reasons which led to their emergence. To go into the line of fire, into the very heat of the battle which has started along the entire front in the course of perestroika, to help the party and the people overcome distrust, to instill an active life position—that is our task today. Is this difficult? Hellishly difficult. It is difficult because some journalists obviously lack knowledge; they are alienated from life; they are not good at judging and analyzing the dynamics of the processes which are being born. It is difficult to restructure. But who does have it easy now? Only those who do not think and do not take upon themselves more than what is prescribed by the official regulations worked out in previous times.

To sum up the conversation about the place of "cooked facts, sensational and salacious stories": in my view, KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA is striving to adhere to a good rule—to combine solid material with entertainment in its stories. We achieve this by no means all the time. But once there is the aspiration the result will happen.

[Question] KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA very rarely publishes poetry, short stories or humor, while advertising occupies up to 20 percent of the space. Is this a position or economics?

[Answer] In the editorial office we frequently compare a newspaper to a person—what does he need to live, to breathe? If there is not enough sports coverage, it means the muscles are weak. If there are not enough poems and short stories, one can survive but something very important and elevating to the soul is obviously lacking. If there is not enough humor, one gets tired of a biting approach.

We think that the reader owes the editorial board nothing except three kopecks for the issue. The editorial board, however, owes the reader everything, including poetry and short stories and humor. And we will be guided by this in the future.

And as for advertisements, you, Aleksey Georgiyevich, have exaggerated. If 20 percent of the newspaper's space were taken up with advertising, we would long ago have become millionaires. The television schedule is not taken into account: we get nothing for publishing it, and we print it only at the request of readers. The remaining advertising and information material takes up in all no more than one-fourth of a type page. Frequently even less. That is as much as specified by the plan.

Do not let the reference to the plan for publication of advertising mislead you. The newspaper is a self-financing enterprise. I can report with satisfaction that KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA workers feed themselves. And beyond that, they provide 600,000 rubles of net profit every year. Without the readers who subscribe to the paper and those who buy it at Soyuzpechat newsstands, that would be impossible.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all the true friends of the newspaper for their attention to it.

08543

**Notion of Georgians' Favored Status Under Stalin Debunked**

18300286 Moscow SOVETSKIY KULTURA in Russian 18 June 88 p 6

[Article by Eldar Shengelaya, film producer, Tbilisi: "Half-truth Feeds the Lie"]

[Text] The process of the democratization of society is expanding its boundaries, and undoubtedly a great contribution to this has been made by our scientific and creative intelligentsia, by our creators who have grasped the deep essence of the past and present through the prism of their own souls and all the human sorrows and joys.

Because I grew up in a family of people who devoted themselves to art and I myself attempt to express my attitude toward life through art, I cannot help but say that in creative work the hardest thing of all is to conceal falsehood. The desire to grasp the truth lies at the foundation of art, while half-truths have always been the source of lies and pseudo-art.

Today is born of the past; the responsibility to the future has brought us face to face with the very serious problem of re-examining and re-evaluating the past, of critically analyzing not only our achievements, but also some tragic mistakes. If we truly want to restructure, then we must know precisely what to restructure, what heritage to reject once and for all and what to affirm and develop.

The establishment of democratization and glasnost has resulted in the publication of some very interesting materials, which have appeared on the pages of many newspapers and magazines; it has revealed many undeservedly forgotten names, phenomena, tragic biographies and documents; it has helped to re-interpret pages of history. Publications devoted to the phenomenon of Stalin have come to play a special place in the efforts to grasp the Truth. I am not undertaking to judge authoritatively and completely all aspects of this global problem; however, I want to note that after the silence and inertia displayed by our republic's radio and press, some very important articles and other materials on this problem have finally appeared in our media in Georgia. This work must be continued with greater intensity. Complete access to archives and documents of that time is essential. Purposeful work will help to re-create a truthful portrait of the epoch. This will help our society to comprehend completely that Stalinism is the opposite of democratization, glasnost and the kind of socialist management which we want to establish. However, people keep turning up who advise not touching the questions concerning the epoch of Stalinism, considering them to be...delicate for Georgia. To me this is incomprehensible.

Stalin as an historical figure was by no means a Georgian phenomenon but rather a Union-wide phenomenon, and subsequently a world-wide one. Georgia never was the

focus of his particular interests and attention. After the ideological battles of the 20's, Stalin began to implement his line; in the process he swept away all opponents and promoted those people who suited him, without hesitating to settle personal accounts along the way. As a result, he became the ruler of the state, an "autocrat," who possessed unlimited power. In exercising this power he carried out violent actions, which were declared to be historical necessity and which brought incalculable sufferings to all the Soviet peoples. Today we seem to be informed about all this, however, not in full measure. Even for certain circles of the Soviet intelligentsia who viewed the film "Repentance" the picture of despotism and the persecution of innocent people in the homeland of the "leader" was a revelation. The legend which is current among the Philistines about the happy life of Georgia under Stalin, to the effect that the republic had no kolkhozes, that the peasants did not pay taxes, that they lived comfortably and happily, enjoying patronage, is absolutely groundless and ridiculous.

The persecutions of the so-called "national-deviationists" in 1922; the repressions and excesses in 1924, 1929-1932; the massive repressions in 1936-1938; the postwar persecutions of the "unreliables"; the eviction of the families of "enemies of the people," of former prisoners of war, of the Georgian Moslems who settled the southern regions of Georgia and of the Grus; the so-called "mingrel affair" and the countless numbers of people who were arrested and/or exiled in the periods between the great purges and campaigns. The tragic list of innocent victims is endless. There were terrible excesses committed by Beria, who servilely and with boundless zeal overfulfilled all the "tasks" assigned by the leader; the excesses grew into a national tragedy, the mass deaths of the best people, thousands and thousands of innocents, among whom were the best sons of Georgia, the pride of the nation: the writer M. Dzhavakhishvili, the poets P. Yashvili and T. Tabidze, the director Ye. Mikeladze, the producer S. Akhmeteli...

One cannot list all the repressed government and party employees, all the creators, scholars, workers and peasants who paid with their lives.

This period left an imprint on my memory, too, although I was a child then. A son-in-law in our family, the remarkable writer Boris Pilnyak, was a victim of repression. They also arrested his wife, my aunt the actress Kira Andronikashvili. Grandmother brought their two-year old son Borya back from Moscow to Tbilisi, and he was raised in our family. The fear was so great that Borya had to stop using his father's last name, the name of an "enemy of the people," and switch to his grandmother's name, Andronikashvili... In Georgia, as throughout the country, there was not a family which was untouched by tragedy. And there was no end to it.

One-third of the population of Georgia went voluntarily to the defense of the Motherland during the Great Patriotic War. Half of them never returned from the field of battle.

Such is the far from complete picture of the "happy" life of Georgia under Stalin, which did not differ from the life of the entire country. I am convinced that the press must inform the reader more fully about the consequences of Stalinism in all the republics and regions of the country by creating a complete picture of these tragic events. The silence on this subject, the lack of education to help the community understand the problem and the failure of ideological work caused young people in Georgia to attend the March 1956 demonstrations and rallies in defense of Stalin, which ended in tragedy. I recall how in my childhood they worked to instil in us the belief that Stalin was the living embodiment of the ideas of socialism and communism: we received this message in school during history and literature lessons, from the movie screen, from the pages of newspapers and magazines, from the radio, and from visual propaganda materials. They worked to persuade us that he contained within himself the best features of the Georgian people, and we believed this. Naturally the young people viewed the criticism of the Stalin cult as an attack on socialism and on national feelings. It was necessary to explain this to the young people the essence of the problem and to look for ways to resolve it. However, the party and government leaders of the time who had uncovered the essence of the cult of personality themselves resorted to condemned methods. Half-truths gave rise to tragedy. They accused the Georgian people of nationalism and narrow political thinking. And then with one flourish of a libertarian decision the entire general staff and officer corps of Georgian nationality was demobilized from the ranks of the Soviet Army. One can imagine what kind of moral blow was inflicted on people who had served our Fatherland with faith and trust, who had given all their physical and spiritual strength to the struggle against fascism.

It is simply immoral to identify historical leaders and their mistakes and crimes with the nationalities which they represent on paper. It was not the peoples who put forward the leaders of that time. Unfortunately, our current publications about Stalin still do not contain a thorough and comprehensive analysis of the historical situation in which the party and state mechanism which shaped the cult of personality was formed. It is essential to do this work now, when we are starting down the path of democracy, in order to draft laws guaranteeing the democratic development of party, state and public life. We must put into effect those protective mechanisms which will guard our society against the repetition of past mistakes in any of their manifestations and will ensure conditions for the development of free and democratic thought. It is for precisely this reason that we are expecting from the forthcoming party congress the whole truth and the establishment in life of the Leninist norms of state and party conduct. Otherwise, as Aleksandr Gelman accurately noted, "democratization will be replaced by liberalization."

Today it is already clear to everyone that in the general process of perestroika and the democratization of society not a single question can be resolved without consideration for the problems of nationality relations. This results from the structural features of our state. And all of these questions are related in the closest possible manner to the question of respect for national languages, cultures and traditions, as well as to questions of internationalism and patriotism.

In this regard I would like to touch on the status of Russian schools in the national republics, and in Georgia in particular. In such multi-nationality republics as ours it is right that these schools exist, but the Georgian language and literature and the republic's history are taught only formally in these schools. So little time is devoted to these subjects that the children who have graduated from Russian schools remain, to put it mildly, completely uninformmed. Georgia has many regions in which Georgians also study in Russian schools. Why must the pupils of these schools have only approximate ideas about their native literature and history? Without this knowledge it is impossible to be a worthy citizen. Why is it not essential for pupils in the various national schools in the republic to know the Georgian language, even if only at a conversational level? Why must they do without the history of that land in which they live?

A knowledge of the language and the history of the culture would help the nationalities to come closer together and to understand each other better. Love and fraternity among peoples and a feeling of friendship is a mutual process, which begins to develop in childhood, in the classroom. In a Soviet school it is mainly the history of Russia which is studied, and this, of course, is important and essential, but it must also take place in a way that does not to hinder the study of the history and culture of the peoples in the republics, subjects which are taught superficially and casually. We have all lived in a common family for quite a long time, and we know only the minimum about each other. This lack of knowledge turns the very idea of a multi-nationality state into a formality. It is essential for us to know each other more and better, keeping in mind the wise saying of the ancients: "To know is to love."

My father, movie producer Nikolay Shengelaya, and Vladimir Mayakovskiy, were friends, and at one time they attended the same Kutaisi gymnasium. The Russian Mayakovskiy knew Russian and Georgian equally well and the Georgian Shengelaya knew Georgian and Russian. And it was the knowledge of the language and culture of Georgia which prompted Mayakovskiy to say: "As soon as I set foot in the Caucasus, I remembered that I was a Georgian." The grammar school helped Mayakovskiy and my father to drink in the best of both cultures equally and harmoniously and to learn about their uniqueness. Unfortunately, this splendid tradition has been lost in our schools.

While I am well aware of the significance of the Russian language as the common language of the state and the language of inter-nationality communication, I must also note that a knowledge of Russian, like the knowledge of any other language, is part of a person's spiritual wealth. It makes it possible for him to associate directly with the great Russian poetry and social thought, and with all of Russian culture. Nonetheless, the national language in the republic must have a definite place; it must play a substantial role, and it must be elevated to the necessary height. The language must be developed in all of its aspects and at all levels of political, social, scientific and cultural life. And if we limit the sphere of its use to any one level, we thus restrict it and harm its development. Lenin warned of the need for a careful, sensitive attitude toward the national languages, and he emphasized that it is necessary to introduce very strict rules with regard to the use of the national language in our Union's republics with other nationalities and to check up on these rules especially carefully...

The mechanical, administratively-bureaucratic and libertarian structure in which we existed must be replaced with new relations between our peoples; they must be expressed in a true and not a formal equality and respect for each other. They must be manifested in greater representation by the republics in the Union-wide government of the country, in greater independence in the resolution of questions concerning national culture, education, the press, all problems of spiritual life, as well as independent actions by the republics in entering into international cultural and economic contacts with interested countries and partners. These new relations must also be manifested in the recruitment of talented personnel from the nationalities into the ranks of the generals and other high staff positions in the Army and Navy. Sometimes the republic's lack of representatives in the Army command and in the space program is explained by the lack of physical training. This thesis is simply ludicrous; after all, it is sufficient to take a look at our Olympic team with its obviously brilliant athletic stars, who are representatives of all the peoples of our country in order to be convinced of the groundlessness of such opinions.

Participation in global and significant government affairs by representatives of all the peoples of our country will increase in all of us the feeling of being part of the creation of our common home. There are no trifles and insignificant questions in inter-nationality affairs. By not resolving in good time those acute problems which could

have been settled, we permitted the situation in Kazakhstan and Karabakh to develop. The new attitude and the new content in our contacts must be founded as well on a knowledge of the unique spiritual values and the historical and cultural traditions in which every people is rich. This natural interest in each other has always existed. In Georgia we became especially aware of this when the previous leadership of Goskino, which was opposed to the success of original Georgian cinematic art, deliberately interfered with the movement of our pictures onto the all-Union screen. However, this pressure further increased the interest which broad circles of viewers have in our films, and it resulted in floods of letters to Georgia from all corners of the country demanding that Georgian picture be shown.

Interethnic relations cannot be resolved without a profound and objective consideration of history. We are silent or we satisfy ourselves with a half-truth on the question of the relations between Lenin and Stalin on the nationality question. We know nothing about why Lenin supported the so-called "Mdivani group." What role in this struggle was played by Stalin, Ordzhonikidze and Dzerzhinsky, whom Lenin called great-power pompous asses. (He demanded the punishment of S. Ordzhonikidze.) Who was Budu Mdivani, whose position was advocated by this group of experienced Georgian Bolsheviks? What was Lenin's position on the question of "autonomization" and what kind of future did he imagine for the republics, for their mutual relations and links with the center?

A return to fundamental Leninist ideas under present-day conditions will help us to set the problem of inter-nationality relations on the correct path. On the threshold of the All-Union Party Conference it would be logical to expose these "gaps" in history, to remove the rust from the nationality question, which became extremely neglected and confused in the stagnant period.

Socrates claimed that the body cannot be healed without healing the soul. The first, the initial stage of perestroika revealed with great clarity that a multitude of abrasions, cancers and sores have formed not only on the body of our society but also on our souls. It became obvious that not only our body—the economy—but also our moral, ethical and spiritual state—the soul of society—need healing. There is only one path which leads to the healing: we must overcome dogmatic thinking and move toward the full democratization of society, toward free thought and toward a high level of morality. That is socialism without rust.

**Kazakhstan Council for Religious Affairs Official  
Answers Readers' Questions**  
18000429 Alma-Ata AGROPROMYSHLENNYY  
KOMPLEKS KAZAKHSTANA in Russian  
No 4, Apr 88 pp 34-35—FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Interview under the "Religion and the Law" rubric with A.I. Artemyev, deputy chairman, Religious Affairs Council, Kazakh SSR under the USSR Council of Ministers. "Proper Procedures Rather Than Excessive Permissiveness"; date and place not given; first two paragraphs in boldface are AGROPROMYSHLENNYY KOMPLEKS KAZAKHSTANA introduction]

**[Text]** It is completely natural that the democratization of public life has considerably broadened the range of readers' letters. The overwhelming majority of them deal with perestroika within the agro-industrial complex, production, the economy, democracy, and social justice.

However, the editors also receive letters in which our readers, in one form or another, touch upon questions connected with religion and law. And it is these questions which comprise the subject of the following interview with A.I. Artemyev, deputy chairman, Religious Affairs Council, Kazakh SSR under the USSR Council of Ministers.

Unfortunately—and this is evident from the mail that I have read—one still encounters scornful and impudent statements with regard to believers and clergymen. What can be said here?... Let me refer to Academician D.S. Likhachev. In one of the issues of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA he noted very correctly that all this is "not merely the fruit of ignorance, but also the lack of another culture—the culture of democracy."

**[Question]** What is the religious situation in Kazakhstan?

**[Answer]** Our republic is a multinational one. Therefore, the most diverse religions are represented here: Islam, Orthodoxy, Roman Catholicism, Protestantism, Judaism, etc.

Operating in the republic in toto are more than 600 religious communities and groups belonging to 16 confessions.

**[Question]** Certain religious trends (confessions) have their own republic-level centers. What specifically are they?

**[Answer]** This republic has the following four religious centers: an eparchical administration of the Russian Orthodox Church, an office of the Spiritual Administration of Muslims of Central Asia and Kazakhstan (SADUM), an office of the senior presbyter of the All-Union Council of Evangelical Christian-Baptists, and an office of the senior preacher of the Seventh-Day Adventists for Kazakhstan. They are all located in Alma-Ata.

Such confessions as Roman Catholicism, Lutheranism, Mennonitism, Pentecostalism, the Old-Believer movement, Judaism, and others traditionally do not have their own centers.

**[Question]** Nowadays who serves in the religious "wheatfield"? What kinds of people are they? What "spiritual food" do they carry to their "flocks"?

**[Answer]** Although this question was posed to us in only one letter—that of the Pfayfer family from Tselinograd Oblast, I think that it would also be of interest to other readers.

Before answering this question, let's first take a look at what requirements clergymen must meet today from their own religious adherents.

Here is an excerpt from the "Collection of Spiritual Articles," published by the All-Union Council of Evangelical Christian-Baptists in 1983:

"...In working to improve himself, a pastor must not only profoundly study the Word of God; he also needs to familiarize himself with an entire series of useful literature which has gained worldwide renown. A pastor should keep abreast of international life; he must also concern himself with the achievements and problems of his own nation. Ministers of the church ought to be well-rounded persons so that they have the necessary authority and influence to conduct educational work."

Similar statements can also be found in the literature of the Orthodox and the Muslims, as well as the Seventh-Day Adventists and practically all such religious groups, regardless of the confessions to which they belong.

Nor can we fail to note that literate, quite well-trained preachers are no longer some kind of exception nowadays, as was the case, for example, 10 or 15 years ago. Now it is more likely to be the rule, rather than the exception.

Their age composition has noticeably changed in the direction of a younger average.

Religious authorities themselves have emphasized that they are "not indifferent as to whom the spiritual leadership will pass in their communities: to random persons from whom it is unknown what to expect, or to well-trained and educated persons who think in contemporary ways."

Young, educated (especially in the sense of spiritual training) ministers work in a more finely tuned, skillful, and persistent way, doing everything to activate the religious life of the associations and each confession as a whole.

It is precisely this, in the first place, which the leaders of religious centers take into account as they strive to "make the religious community leaders' average age younger" as rapidly as possible.

Even those religious ministers who, for one reason or another, have quite an unfriendly attitude toward our system and our society no longer seek direct confrontation nowadays, but instead attempt to mask their views in all manner of ways so as not to be completely isolated from their own flocks.

It's characteristic that even the religious extremists—that most reactionary portion of the clergy—feel compelled to camouflage their antisocial activity under a religious covering.

For example, it is widely known how reactionary and frequently remote from religion the activities of the leaders of the Evangelical Christian-Baptist "Council of Churches" are. But just read their writings, for example, the "Pastoral Service." The following is written there in black and white: "The vocation of preaching the Gospel of Christ to the world does not free a pastor from his responsibility and obligations as a citizen."

See how the matter is put?

Although in practice, unfortunately, those who wrote this manual themselves violate their own prescription, the fact of their having written it is indicative by itself.

Even the bare-faced extremists understand that they would be isolated if they were to openly advocate their anti-Soviet point of view. Or consider another part of the problem. It's indicative that in most of their sermons and interviews they express complete support for our state's domestic and foreign policy; they approve of the measures connected with the restructuring which is now being carried out in our country, the struggle against unearned income, bribery, misuse of service positions, drunkenness and drug addiction, all of which is, to our way of thinking, a reflection of the clergy's overall loyalty.

As you know, religious associations actively participate in peacemaking activities and in the peace advocates' movement.

But all this, figuratively speaking, is just one side of the coin. The other side, however, and it must by no means be left out of consideration, reflects the fact that in their social points of view the clergy's foremost attempt has always been and remains to prove the "truth of their own faith" to believers and nonbelievers alike. And even in dealing with certain social problems, so to speak, of secular life, they naturally strive to turn everything to the advantage of religion; they refract sociopolitical, legal, moral-ethical, cultural-educational, and other questions through their own dogmas.

I think that my answer would still be incomplete if I were to fail to re-focus attention on the negative viewpoint of some ministers and believers, from among unregistered religious associations.

What I am talking about is extremism.

How does it manifest itself?

In the refusal of religious associations to register, in illegal missionary activity, in attempts to organize group religious instruction of children, etc. And, finally, it also includes slanderous inventions directed against the Soviet state.

Of course, all of this must be rebutted and is being rebutted in a worthy manner.

But despite all the similarity in the viewpoints of the extremist formations, we should, nonetheless, not try to "make everyone fit into the same pattern." Among them are, indeed, extremely embittered persons who have an openly anti-Soviet attitude. For them religion is merely a screen.

There are also others. While not abandoning the course inherent in these associations, they are, at the same time, not averse to creating around themselves an oreole of "purely ideological fighters for the faith."

But there is yet a third group. And it perhaps constitutes the majority. It is comprised of those persons who, for one reason or another, have fallen under the influence of unscrupulous religious politicians.

And, of course, we must not only take all this into account but also carefully make fine distinctions among such groups.

As you can see, the social portrait of the present-day clergy and believers has a great many faces.

[Question] The principal indicator of loyalty and an attitude of respect for the Law is the registration of a religious society. Isn't it for this reason that the religious extremists and their foreign sponsors attack precisely this part of the Soviet legislation with such fury?

[Answer] The registration of religious organizations is a means of providing a civics lesson for believers. It facilitates combining the specific interests of believers with the interests of the entire society. Therefore, in the legislation on religious groups, as well as other documents, it is accorded top-priority attention.

It is precisely for this reason that the essence of registration is being distorted by all those persons for whom religion serves merely as a screen for subversive activity. This—and religious extremists; even though there are

not really too many in our country, they do, unfortunately, exist. This—and their ideological instigators from various foreign, anti-Soviet centers, etc.

Moreover, they are intentionally silent about the quite important fact that registration of religious associations is mandatory not only in our country. It is also provided for by the legislations of other countries.

[Question] But distorting the concept of the essence of registering religious organizations is common not only among believers. Instances are still encountered whereby local organs of authority either refuse to perform this for believers, or they delay considering their applications too long. How is such a position to be explained?

[Answer] It's a legitimate question. And it's obviously not by chance that it came from readers in Chimkent Oblast. The force of inertia is manifesting itself, as well as fear, as if someone would not say that educational work had been poorly set up with regard to believers. But, you know, that's really absurd.

This is the very same false show against which a determined struggle has now been declared everywhere in our country. Such a vicious practice is utterly inadmissible; it fundamentally contradicts the USSR Constitution and the legislation on religious groups.

Registration creates neither religious societies nor believers. It merely brings their activities in line with the Law. And, as you know, it must be observed by both believers and by the organs of authority.

[Question] The inhabitants of the village of Olgino, Uspenskiy Rayon, Pavlodar Oblast not long before the May Holidays were astounded by the fact that their village suddenly became virtually the site for a kind of motor rally: more than 150 passenger cars with license numbers from the country's most diverse oblasts assembled there. And all this "turmoil" was occasioned by the return from sites where the leaders of the local community of followers of the so-called "Council of Evangelical Christian-Baptist Churches" had held meetings.

[Answer] In my opinion, this specific instance manifested that same viewpoint of the sideline observer which certain officials of the local organs of authority prefer to take, as also do even the law-enforcement organs with regard to the illegal actions of religious extremists. They often conduct merely endless conversations and vacuous debates where they should use their authority.

[Question] In Kazakhstan, as in other republics, of the Soviet East, Islam has always been a traditional religion. What is its situation at present? How strong is the position of this confession nowadays?

[Answer] This republic has only three oblasts—East Kazakhstan, Kustanay, and Mangyshlak—where there are no operational mosques. But this does not at all mean that there are no people practicing this religion there.

The fact of the matter is that, according to the Islamic canons, attending mosques is not obligatory at all. Considerably more importance is accorded to religious practices and rituals.

Such rituals as the following are particularly widespread: the dzhnaya (funeral service), sunnat (circumcision of young male children), mikakh (wedding), etc.

In a number of populated centers where there are no mosques divine services are frequently conducted outdoors at the time of religious holidays.

Pilgrimages to the so-called "holy places" have not been curtailed.

There are also illegal activities by clergymen without mosques, or, as they are still called, "wandering mullahs."

It is precisely they who are implanting the so-called "parallel Islam." It is specifically under their influence that the feudal-landlord, clan-tribal vestiges are being preserved and, connected with them, negative manifestations and actions, along with deviations from the norms of our morality. All this is interwoven with the phenomena of nationalism in the closest manner.

It must be said straightforwardly that the entire microclimate in this republic during the last few years has facilitated a revival of Islam: the observance of religious rituals was proclaimed as practically the chief virtue, and in certain circles of the intelligentsia it has become a kind of "good form."

Those who are fond of warming their hands at the fire of religion, along with their sponsors, have not received a principled evaluation.

Matters have gotten to the stage where even CPSU members have begun to function as mullahs in several places. Such as "party stratum," if one can call it that among Muslim clergymen has been strengthened by the circumstances of excessiveness.

Arriving one day at our office was CPSU member Sarsenbay Ashenov, who lives in Urdinskiy Rayon, Uralsk Oblast. According to him, he reads the Koran well, and, therefore, he is constantly being invited to conduct the dzhnaza. And he does this willingly. At first he was still bothered by doubts. But when he turned for advice to the party raykom, and they dismissed his concerns, he calmed down. All the more so inasmuch as he was conducting the dzhnaza primarily over those deceased persons who had been members of Communist families. But he came to see us in connection with

the fact that he had read the law on Increasing Responsibility for Unearned Incomes. And this is what began to disturb him: if he were to officially report his income to the financial organs, then he would have to register himself as a mullah (and he is a party member), whereas if he were to conceal the fact that he performs the functions of a mullah, he could be charged with receiving unearned income.

Where there is excessive permissiveness, the Law will always be flouted.

Nowadays the state of affairs in the republic is being corrected. But it must be said straight out that this process is still proceeding more slowly than I would like.

**COPYRIGHT:** "Agropromyshlennyy kompleks Kazakhstana"—"Qazaqstan Agroonerkesibi" 2384

**Metropolitan Filaret on Christianization of Kievan Rus**

18000427a Moscow NEDELYA in Russian No 18,  
2-8 May 88 pp 8-9

[Interview by IZVESTIYA correspondent N. Matukovskiy, under the rubric: "Toward the 1,000th Anniversary of The Introduction of Christianity to Rus;" "How the Russian Land Began...," with Metropolitan of Minsk and Belorussia Filaret, chairman, Department of Foreign Church Relations of the Moscow Patriarchy, permanent member, Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church]

[Text] [Question] There are many questions in the letters to the editors on the 1,000th anniversary of the Baptism of Rus. Here is the first of them: Is 988 the actual, historical date of the Baptism of Rus, or is it a purely symbolic date?

[Answer] To answer this, we must make a brief excursion into the past... In the 5th-6th centuries a union of Slavic tribes had formed in the central Dnepr area, led by a tribe of Russians who lived in the Rus river basin. This union was also the beginning of the ancient Russian state. The ancient chronicles say that the Russians participated in trips made by the Slavs to Byzantium. Many of them adopted the Christian faith there. Prince Igor's famous treaty with Byzantium in 944 attests to the further spread of Christianity in Rus. The chronicles also tell of the visit by Princess Olga, Prince Igor's widow, to Constantinople in 955 and her baptism there. While raising her grandchildren, she first planted the noble seeds of the Christian faith in the heart of the future baptizer of all Rus. "The Tale of Bygone Years" speaks of the Baptism of Rus at about 988. Precisely this year is considered to be the date of the adoption of Christianity in Rus in its Eastern Orthodox form and the beginning of the historical existence of the Russian Orthodox Church.

[Question] Does this mean that if it were not for Vladimir and his grandmother Olga, who had this influence on him, Rus would have remained... pagan?

[Answer] Of course not! Providentially for the adoption of Christianity in Rus, objective historical and economic conditions had formed... I would even call it an historical inevitability. If not Prince Vladimir, the baptizer of Rus would most likely have been his son Yaroslav the Wise. After all, it is for good reason that the chronicles say: that which Vladimir plowed, Yaroslav sowed.

One can only admire the profound state wisdom of the great Prince Vladimir, who had realized that Rus could no longer develop under a pagan faith. The worship of a number of different idols by various tribes had created distrust and enmity among them and sowed the seeds of senseless, fratricidal civil wars. Most often it was not the tribal leaders but the simple people who perished in these. Moreover, even today we can still see this, when the question of whose religion is better is decided by fire and sword.

Even in those distant times Vladimir understood that the inhabitants of Rus needed a single belief and common moral ideals and spiritual values. He realized that Rus needed a single state ideology. At that time, this ideology could only have been a state religion. Prince Vladimir was led not only by religious but also by state motivations.

The baptism itself signified the start of a fundamentally new national self-awareness, which helped the Russian people perceive themselves as a people of a single belief, historically united. Our ancestors, the Slavs, had created the great and free Rus, the cradle of three fraternal peoples—Russians, Ukrainians and Belorussians, related through the ancient and indissoluble bonds of unity of kin and belief. They rallied an inviolable and eternal family of other fraternal peoples about themselves. Thus, they laid the foundations for the existence of our unified multinational Homeland.

Christianity fundamentally changed not only the entire state structure. It restructured the ancient Russian pagan family upon the principles of Christian morality, imposing its own vivid, humanizing stamp upon the ancient Russian civic laws, mitigating pagan mores. It also enriched the Slavic peoples with new scientific and philosophical concepts which had previously been unknown to them.

All of the estates gained from the introduction of Christianity except for the pagan priesthood, which had become useless. Some of the priests "went underground" and some resisted. While Prince Vladimir paid no attention to the first, believing that it was unreasonable to demand everything immediately, he was merciless toward any opposition to his feudal reforms. However, I

would like to emphasize a detail which is very important in principal: "fire and the sword" did not introduce the new religion, but created the centralized feudal state, i.e., created a new society.

[Question] Would it be possible to consider 988 the year of the definitive victory of Christianity in Rus?

[Answer] No, this was its official beginning. Even in Kiev not everyone was baptized immediately. However, nonetheless, in the first 3 years the Christian belief triumphed along the entire "great route from the Varangians to the Greeks." In certain regions in the North the spread of Christianity was resisted by remnants of the pagan priesthood and the soothsayers. Armed interference even became necessary in Novgorod. The complete victory of Christianity in our state took almost a century. Considering the size of Rus, this was a very short period of time. Let us note, for example, that Sweden and Norway, which were becoming Christian at the same time as Rus, required about 250 and 150 years for the complete victory of the new religion.

[Question] I would like to ask you about something here... This question is found in many of our readers' letters... We know from history that missionaries and representatives of various religions came to the great Prince Vladimir. Most likely, each of them tried to convert the prince to his own belief. Why did Prince Vladimir select Byzantium as the prototype for his own state?

[Answer] In those days, Byzantium had outstripped all the West European countries in terms of the development of spiritual and material culture. The Byzantine variant of Christianity met the urgent needs of the ancient Russian state, which was just coming into being. The acceptance of Orthodoxy, if one can put it this way, automatically elevated Rus several steps higher up in comparison to other states.

The fact is that close economic and cultural relations had formed with Byzantium at that time. Geographically, it was relatively close, and the Slavs understood its culture. There was yet another circumstance which influenced Prince Vladimir's choice—the existence of nearby and kindred Bulgaria, which had adopted Christianity 100 years before Kievan Rus. The Solunskiy brothers Kirill and Mefodiy had already created a written Slavonic language. Evidently, Vladimir had learned that divine services in the Orthodox church could be performed in a language which the people understood.

Church practice and worship required literacy, books and art, and on the broadest scales as well. Schools, books and education were ecclesiastica for a long time. Architecture, painting and music were inherent in church monuments. Christianity stimulated the development of a proper written language in Rus. By the mid-11th century the influence of outstanding monuments of ecclesiastical literature had already been noted,

such as the profoundly patriotic "Sermon on Law and Grace" by Kievan Metropolitan Ilarion, the first Russian metropolitan, appointed by Yaroslav the Wise.

The schools and libraries which appeared in the times of Saint Vladimir and Yaroslav the Wise became the most important means of disseminating education in Kievan Rus. In addition to Yaroslav the Wise's Sofia library, libraries sprang up in Kiev and certain other cities, for instance, in Polotsk, as well.

Undoubtedly, the Kiev-Pechersk Monastery had the richest library. It had developed an entire galaxy of Russian writers, foremost among them being Saint Nestor the Chronicler, the "father of Russian history." He compiled the Russian chronicle "The Tales of Bygone Years," which, in the opinion of eminent scientists, is "an integral literary account of the history of Russia." Bishop Kirill Turovskiy was also a talented writer, who left a great literary legacy in the form of ceremonial sermons, ascetic and hymnal works.

Monastic rules imposed the duty of reading books upon each monk. From the biography of Father Superior Feodosiy Pecherskiy, written by Saint Nestor, we know that intense book-making work took place in Feodosiy's cell. The monk Ilarion wrote books day and night, the monk Nikon bound them and Father Superior Feodosiy himself spun the thread for the bindings. We should be grateful to them, our first book-makers, for their achievement.

At that time, monasteries were the only place in which there was an opportunity for scientific studies. They were a sort of university and academy. Here tracts on various themes were written and young people acquired an education. Princes came to the monasteries not only for prayers but also for advice. Our own Russian intelligentsia was created here. Yes, at first masters invited from Byzantium built the stone buildings and cathedrals and decorated them with mosaics, frescoes and icons. However, Russian craftsmen worked beside them and often exceeded the mastery of their teachers. The culture which came to Rus with the adoption of Christianity continued to develop in the distinctive soil of national creativity.

[Question] So, the implementation of the reform by Princes Vladimir and Yaroslav placed Rus on a level with all the civilized countries in the world. Rus was not their inferior either in culture, in crafts or in military affairs...

[Answer] Precisely! The success of the ancient Russian state made a striking impression upon its contemporaries. One Western chronicler (Adam of Bremen) referred to Kiev as a "jewel of the East and rival of Constantinople." Perhaps the dynastic marriages attest best of all to the fact that Kievan Rus had become "an equal among equals." Prince Vladimir married the Byzantine emperor's sister Anna. Yaroslav married the King of Sweden's

daughter; his sister became Queen of Poland and three of his daughters became the Queens of Hungary, Norway and France. His son married the King of Poland's sister, his grandson wed the King of England's daughter, and his granddaughter married the emperor of the "Holy Roman Empire".... In those days, this was the highest form of recognition.

[Question] Our readers are interested in learning about the international ties of the Russian Orthodox Church.

[Answer] The Russian Orthodox Church, via the Department of Foreign Church Relations, maintains permanent ties with its foreign institutions, located in thirty countries. Fraternal relations are kept up with local Orthodox churches, non-Orthodox churches and religious associations, and world-wide and regional Christian organizations and movements. The goal of our foreign mission is church unity and peace among people. We must do everything possible to preserve the sacred gift of life, to save our planet—ancient, but constantly being transformed through human genius and labor.

Man, as the crown of creation, is responsible for everything which takes place on earth. His actions can have good or fatal consequences both for himself and his offspring, as well as for the surrounding environment. Man must not forget that the preservation of peace is a necessary condition and the means of implementing his high destiny...

The critical moment has come in which people must think and act in a new way. We who serve the Russian Orthodox Church are striving to overcome distrust and suspicion in relations among peoples and governments. We are trying to eliminate the "image of the enemy," by which the USSR and the socialist countries are intentionally ill represented.

Today the "peace or war" dilemma means "life or death" for mankind. We choose life. However, a choice in words alone means little: one must act. Faith, it says in the Holy Scripture, is beyond the concerns of the dead. Scientists have convincingly shown what will happen if even a single nuclear salvo is carried out: the "nuclear winter" will come. There would be neither winners nor losers in such a war: the lack of heat, light, food and fresh water and the poisoning of the atmosphere with toxic gases would affect the entire planet equally. Even if someone, having pushed the button, manages to sit it out in some inconceivable sort of refuge, then, coming out of it, he would find a rather different planet upon which life would be quite impossible.

The Russian Orthodox Church is doing all that it can so that this does not happen. That is why we so enthusiastically accepted the invitation of the U.S. National Council of Churches of Christ to visit their country

during the CPSU General Secretary's visit there. We spent several days in joint prayers for the success of the summit talks. We believe that a good beginning has been established.

Now, on the threshold of a new summit meeting, we await the arrival of our American brothers in Moscow, so that this good beginning can be further developed.

13362

#### Metropolitan Vladimir Refutes Congressional Resolution

18000427b Moscow *IZVESTIYA* in Russian  
27 May 88 p 6

[Article: "Metropolitan Vladimir on Congress's Strange Resolution"]

[Text] An *IZVESTIYA* correspondent asked Rostov and Novocherkassk Metropolitan Vladimir, manager of affairs of the Moscow Patriarchy, to express his opinion on the 19 May resolution of the U.S. Congressional House of Representatives, proposed by republican House member Christopher Smith, for the purposes of, as he declared, "religious glasnost" in connection with the summit meeting in Moscow.

In answering the correspondent, Metropolitan Vladimir noted that, while the document was addressed to our government and not to the church, he was prepared to express his viewpoint on it, since the content of the resolution has direct bearing upon religious life in the Soviet Union.

The basic content of the resolution is an extensive list of accusations directed to our government of violations of religious freedom and demands toward it in connection with this.

The resolution presented the entire post-revolutionary 70-year period of the church's life in a monosemantic, which it was not, and distorted fashion, without any consideration whatsoever of the religious reality of past decades, in the course of which the church has performed its spiritual mission in accomplishing its daily pastoral service and testimony. Moreover, the document is contradictory to the essence itself of the church's contemporary situation in our government. During the period of restructuring, democratization and glasnost, it would be unnatural, although the document asserts this, to observe a prohibition of believers of our churches and religious associations against holding religious rites or inviting clergymen to their homes, for our citizens to serve prison sentences for their belief, to impede the distribution of the Bible and other religious literature and the import of it from abroad, and not to permit the creation of new communities and construction of new cathedrals, as well as the expansion of the training of clergy in spiritual academic institutions.

To substantiate the realities of the life of the Russian Orthodox Church, I shall cite some examples. Since 1971, over 30 million people have been baptized in our cathedrals. Recently, the number of newly opened parishes in many dioceses and the construction of new cathedrals and diocesan centers has increased. In response to a request by the religious leaders of our church, the Saint Daniilov monastery in Moscow, the Vvedenskaya Optina Hermitage Monastery in Kaluga Oblast and the Tolgskiy Monastery in Yaroslavl Oblast were transferred by the government and returned to operation. To celebrate the 1,000th anniversary of the baptism of Rus we have published a 100,000-copy edition of our Bible in Russian, and we are receiving 150,000 copies of the Bible With Concordance in Russian and 100,000 copies of the Bible in Ukrainian as a

gift from Bible societies abroad. The number of students in all of our spiritual academic institutions has grown strongly and we intend to continue this expansion even further. In only 5 months of 1988, 68 Russian Orthodox cathedrals have been reopened. This is reality.

I suggest that the adoption by the U.S. House of Representatives of said resolution is nothing more than a strange phenomenon, which is not promoting the reinforcement of trust among our peoples. It is incomprehensible, how to explain the selection by the House of such a unique form of "support" for the forthcoming summit meeting!

13362

**Scholar Blasts Zhdanov Attacks on Leading Cultural Figures**

18000457 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 1 Jun 88 p 6

[Interview with V. V. Ivanov, friend of B. Pasternak, by Irina Rishina: "... and Soil and Fate Are Breathing"; Peredelkino, date not specified]

[Excerpts] [Question] In Peredelkino near Moscow, these two houses stand side by side—the Pasternak house and the Ivanov house. The family of Vsevolod Ivanov is one of the first settlers of the little town for writers: In 1935 the son Vyacheslav became seriously ill, and the doctors insisted that he must lie motionlessly in the open air. B. Pasternak at first occupied another dacha, being a neighbor to B. Pilnyak—they were friends, but after the arrest of B. Pilnyak in 1937 (some wit bitterly renamed the Peredelkino of that day Posadil'kino) he became so melancholy there that, when an opportunity offered itself, he moved here, having settled between K. Fedin and V. Ivanov. By this time, the long-standing friendly relations had become fortified between B. Pasternak and V. Ivanov, with whom the same B. Pilnyak had acquainted him at some point in time.

In one year—the year 1958—as they say, within the hour, misfortune befell both of these houses: B. Pasternak was excluded from the Writer's Union, and his younger friend was made the subject of persecution. "At fault" was "Dr. Zhivago." And now, 30 years later, and also almost in a day, these houses were touched by the wing of another time. The rejected "Dr. Zhivago" has returned—in the April issue of NOVYY MIR the publication of the novel was completed. And the same April (not mysticism, of course, and, I believe, not mere chance, but a remarkable and symbolic coincidence, deliberate good will) brought the recognition of the scientific merits of V. Ivanov: Together with Academician T. Gamkrelidze, he was awarded the country's chief prize—the Lenin Prize—for the monograph "The Indo-European Language and the Indo-European." April is returning to us the Leninist view, the Leninist attitude to talent as a national achievement. . . . Perhaps, the decision taken these very same spring days—to make the house of B. Pasternak in Peredelkino into a memorial museum for the poet—will now become a fact of the restructuring in culture, its reality. For the time being, the house is still deaf and dumb, and the sign at the wicket-gate "There Will Be a Museum Here" does not know when it will be replaced by another one: "The Museum Is Open from. . . to. . .," but the hope exists that this time it will not have to wait for long.

. . . The window in the room where I am talking with Ivanov looks onto the Pasternak side. My congratulations on the double holiday—of the author of "Dr. Zhivago" and his—returned Vyacheslav Vsevolodovich to the year 1958.

[Answer] I think Z. Papernyy best of all interpreted this situation. In his comic verse, there are four lines about how Zelinskiy, who had called himself a friend of my father, spoke at the meeting of the Moscow writers: "There K. Zelinskiy is speaking, having raised a commotion in the hall, and is proposing to send his friend's son to prison in any case." At that time not only Zelinskiy, but also his colleagues at Moscow State University, where I was working, proposed to deal with me in precisely the same way. They did not send me to prison, although some people recommended that this be done, but they drove me from the university with monstrous accusations—papers have been preserved, they make for interesting re-reading today. . . . A special commission of the philological faculty questioned me: How I regard Pasternak, his novel? The answer, naturally, sharply diverged from what it was supposed to say and what they in vain tried to obtain from me. My disagreement with the official appraisal of "Dr. Zhivago," thanks to the papers sent by the commission to various places, became widely known, as if it had received the right of citizenship—this was perhaps even good, and good for Boris Leonidovich as well (although one man does not think "like all"). He was very upset that because of him such a thing happened with me. After 3 months, I found work in the Institute of Precision Mechanics and Computer Technology and in addition half-time employment in the Pedagogical Institute of Foreign Languages—there a department was opened up for machine translation; it was a piece of good fortune that I had been engaged in it before my mishaps began.

[Question] Thus, we have a paradox here. You were saved by cybernetics, which was also being persecuted?

[Answer] I remember, someone in precisely this way told Akhmatova about me, and she, in her characteristic irony, said: I have heard, "cybernetics has saved." If they had not permitted cybernetics at that time, if the greatest mathematicians Lyapunov and Kolmogorov had not supported me, there is no telling how this all would have come out and how soon I would have found work. They tried to stop my expulsion and appealed to the rector Petrovskiy. And he, in general, a good man and also a good scientist, suggested to me to write a letter of the following content: I am prepared to think about that I am not correct in my attitude to "Dr. Zhivago." "You cannot imagine," he explained to me, "how little a person occupying a post, even a high one, can do in our country." I refused. Petrovskiy procrastinated for three months, they signed the order for the dismissal when he had either left or had fallen ill. . . .

The humanists did not want to have anything to do with me; not only the doors of Moscow State University closed for me, but I also had to leave the journal VOPROSY YAZYKOZHANIYA, where I was deputy chief editor. Now the editorial board has been completely changed, and I have returned. For 30 years I have not given lectures, and beginning this year I am again

teaching—at the faculty of information science of the Historical Archive Institute, I was invited by Yu. Afanasyev, who has become its rector.

[Question] All of us are living for restructuring and its fate. What, in your view, are the tasks of the intelligentsia?

[Answer] I think that in the present situation a great deal is required of the intelligentsia. Its chief task is to boldly formulate what can be proposed for the future, and the task of the party and state leadership—not to be afraid that the intelligentsia will formulate something that is far beyond the dogmatic boundaries.

[Question] Imagine that cultural figures not belonging to the party were invited to take part in the 19th Party Conference, were given the opportunity to express their views, and you, too, were called upon to speak. About what would you speak?

[Answer] About culture. About the fact that the official bureaucratic-type forms of its regulation should be destroyed and replaced by well-thought-out forms of spontaneous activity. Well-thought-out because the creative unions, too, have stagnated, have accustomed themselves to their ministerial appearance, they have been transformed, it seems to me, into institutions. Compare the original intentions of Gorki with the now Union of Writers existing now. Gorki, however, had in mind a meeting of original and independent artists, who through their personal peculiarities would guarantee a kind of functioning of the Union of Writers. You think: One of the main authoritative people of the poetry guild was exactly Pasternak—how far then did the Union depart from the ideal that had been proposed by Gorki. Our routine Union is in need of the quickest radical reform. Incidentally, this is convincingly demonstrated by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, which is its printed organ. Its dependence on the Union places obvious limitations on it. The paths of departmentalism do not permit it to discuss literary subjects as freely and boldly as many others.

Everything in our culture can be organized much more judiciously, more simply, without bureaucratic barriers, and without the hosts of bureaucrats. Through the elimination of the barriers alone, we would obtain a gigantic creative take-off of our art and literature. I am convinced that in these spheres we cannot manage without an administrative reform. It will write off a large number of people, but they are ballast in our culture today, and we do not have alternatives.

It is necessary to fortify through legislation: Culture is an autonomous sphere, which does not dare to be invaded by people who do not understand it, incompetent people, whatever high party and state posts they occupy.

In this connection, possibly, I would talk about such great figures of the party as Chicherin, who did have a genuine understanding and love of poetry and music, and who wrote a brilliant book about Mozart. I know from an eye-witness how he argued with Stalin: He came to a meeting in the Kremlin with a pile of books on Russian history, every one of them with bookmarks. It is remarkable that, given his enormous culture and his colossal knowledge, Chicherin never undertook the management of anything in art, in a limited and natural way he used his knowledge in his own diplomatic field.

Aleksandr Blok, in his speech of 1921 "On the Purpose of the Poet," which has become his testament, said that the poet has been charged with three things: "First of all—to free the sounds from the native eternal element in which they reside; secondly—to bring these sounds into harmony and to give them form; and thirdly—to introduce this harmony into the external world." Following Pushkin, with the anniversary of whose death Blok's speech was timed, he branded with the shameful name of "mob" all those who tried to hinder the poet in his "third" task.

The traditions of the past are tenacious; both Benkendorf and Bulgarin continue terrestrial coexistence, even if in new aspects. They did not lose the weightiness of Blok's warnings: "Let those bureaucrats be aware of a worse name who intend to direct poetry in accordance with some channels of their own, infringing on its secret freedom and preventing it from fulfilling its mysterious purpose."

Now, when on the wave of social renewal we are reflecting on the fate of our culture and about its future, holding back to the best of my ability the desire to use "the worse names," I would like to speak about a man who more than deserved them—about Zhdanov. Given great power by Stalin, he, it appeared, set himself the task of trampling down all culture, everything that was and, moreover, that still could be created in it. In regard to the traces of the destructive activity of Zhdanov that are being sensed up to now, it must be understood: A separate problem of the distortion of truth in biology, literary criticism or music does not exist, there is one general question—the question of the freedom of the creativeness of the human spirit and thought. It was counter-indicative to Zhdanov, he destroyed it in every manifestation.

The main thing that is depressing in such people as Zhdanov is their profound and insuperable lack of talent, which they spread like an infection. Everything talented, everything outstanding is alien to them, they mercilessly suppress any manifestation of natural gifts. I am not talking about Zhdanov alone, but about the human and social type which he embodied: A half-educated person and know-all, who have presumptuously taken it upon themselves to be the chief intellectual and aesthetic authority of the country.

The tragedy of the time, in my view, consisted in the unequal opposition of nonentities similar to Zhdanov who had power and people of genius, with which Russian culture was flourishing at that time. The crime of Stalin and Zhdanov (and their accomplices, whose names, I am convinced, will be named as the documents relating to this period will be printed and researched) against Russian culture is especially great as they started to try to destroy it during the most fruitful time. There is no sphere of spiritual activity to which Russian artists, writers, thinkers and scientists did not make an appreciable contribution during the first half of the 20th century, which is already valued by the entire world (sometimes, unfortunately, extremely late here in our Homeland: We have only now begun to discover for ourselves the fine arts of the 1920's, and the discovery of the greatness of Russian philosophy of that time still lies ahead). In the rich inflorescence of the great poets of the post-Blok generation, in which our literature by right takes pride, Akhmatova was the first of the first. And it was on her that Zhdanov's curses were brought down. Citations from his report, striking for their crudity, are quoted in Yu. Karyakin's article "Is It Worthwhile to Step on Rakes?," in the lead article of the October issue of the journal KOMMUNIST.

[Question] They are also found in Yu. Karyakin's new, scorching article "Zhdanovist Weakness or Against Slandering."

[Answer] It was necessary to recall the base style of the mean and abusive Zhdanovist expressions, as it is necessary for the edification of subsequent generations to preserve his works in the libraries. And meanwhile I have discovered that it is already difficult to find them in the libraries. In the torrent of Zhdanovist curses, Akhmatova herself was most hurt by the aspersions on her personal life. I heard time and again how Anna Andreyevna with disgust talked about the wrongful accusations raised against her by Zhdanov; she put the sign of equality between him and the authors of deceitful memoirs slandering her name which by that time had been published in the West. And in both cases her honor as a woman was insulted. Too often, looking at the martyr's face of Akhmatova, I felt the necessity of taking upon myself even if only part of the burden weighing upon her.

A peasant who scoffs at a woman in public is loathsome. But if this peasant is a well-known political figure and the woman is a great poet, the monstrosity of the crime committed demands historical retribution. I do not want to conceal: What I am saying now is also an act of personal revenge on Zhdanov for me.

Before my eyes is the worn-out appearance of Zoshchenko, who during the last months of his life suffered a nervous breakdown: Like Gogol, he stopped eating entirely long before his death. The reasons, I believe,

lead to the terrible time when Zoshchenko and Akhmatova, who were not being published anywhere and lacked the means of subsistence, were deprived of their food ration cards.

From the recording of a speech by Zoshchenko, reproduced not long ago by D. Granin in OGONEK, it is evident that when after the death of Stalin, he was given the opportunity to begin to talk about this in public, he repudiated all of Zhdanov's accusations point by point. But even before that time, Zoshchenko defended his innocence. His striking courage is indicated by a letter sent to Stalin at the very beginning of the persecution: "... Iosif Vissarionovich! ... "This is a mistake" (at that time Stalin already did not ever make mistakes in anything). He wrote to Stalin, and not to Zhdanov, because he knew who was the main stage manager of the play in which only the details of the execution could belong to Zhdanov. The word "scum," which especially offended Zoshchenko, could in this case be used by Zhdanov himself, but that way of talking about writers was fully in the spirit of Stalin. They tell, for example, that in Platonov's story "For Future Use," published in KRASNAYA NOV, he left the instruction: "Swine."

Many months after the decree on the journals ZVEZDA and LENINGRAD, in the fall of 1947, I happened to lead a study group in a certain Moscow plant. When I asked the workers whom among the contemporary writers they had read, it turned out that they had never heard of Azhayev and other recipients of the Stalin Prize of that day. But on the other hand, without collusion, they named Zoshchenko. It turned out that a collection of his stories fell into the hands of one worker, who passed it on to another, so the book made the rounds throughout the entire plant. But you see, at that time they had already stopped publishing him. But people did not cease to read him. Like Akhmatova. Anna Andreyevna said about herself that she was living by the motto "Down with Gutenberg!" The best poems in Russia in all times have circulated in manuscripts. And Akhmatova continued this tradition. And when, already posthumously, they started to publish her, they all the same disappeared instantly. Do these signs of the nationwide recognition of Akhmatova and Zoshchenko not serve as an additional reminder: The decree on the journals ZVEZDA and LENINGRAD should be rescinded, and the 19th Party Conference may, probably, do this. During the last years of her life, it dumbfounded and distressed Akhmatova that even school children were informed about this decree as a force of preservation. This reminded me of the repeated pronouncements of the anathema against Leo Tolstoy: Tolstoy hardly lost from them.

When Zhdanov attacked Zoshchenko and Akhmatova, this was the logical development of his report presented 12 years earlier at the First Writers' Congress: Already at this congress, he tried to subject literature to goals that were understood by him in a dogmatically narrow manner. The false doctrine spread by Zhdanov required writers to describe not what they perceive, but what the

bureaucrat orders them to see in the future: According to Zhdanov, this is the "romanticism" without which "socialist realism," in his understanding, is impossible. Not all literary critics agreed with Zhdanov. Courageous opposition was offered for a number of years by G. Lukach and his comrades on the LITERATURNYY KRITIK, until the journal (the only one in which Platonov could be printed in those years!) was closed down right before the war. Gradually the Zhdanov orientation in literary criticism found increasingly more followers. It surprises me that the writers, who in recent years have expended so much effort to demonstrate the monstrosity of Lysenkoism in biology, have passed by an almost greater pseudo-science flourishing up to now in very close proximity with literature—in literary criticism. I do not wish for my statement to be perceived as a duel with a shadow. I propose to all who in their time lavishly cited and based themselves on Zhdanov's writings on literature to defend them publicly today. Perhaps someone will succeed in doing this?

How unerringly Zhdanov selected for his attacks the newest and universally significant in our art is clearly visible in the example of music. Not long ago, I saw the film "Alto Sonata" of the talented film directors Aranovich and Sokurov. The documentary cadres in it are utilized as a biographical commentary to the music of Shostakovich. We see the homage rendered to Zhdanov during a demonstration. There are also flashes of the episodes of the public abuses of Shostakovich started by Zhdanov during the postwar period. No posthumous glory compensates for the bitterness of the humiliation which the great Shostakovich suffered during his life through the fault of Zhdanov.

I say again: Is it not time to introduce a law inflicting a penalty for encroachment on the secrets of art and culture?

On 16 November 1943, I. Selvinskiy noted in his diary how he was called by telegram to Shcherbakov in Moscow from the front, from the Adzhimushkayskiye Quarries. When he arrived by air, it turned out that the reason for the removal was the poem "Rossii," published a year before in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA and in the front newspapers. The participants of a session of the Central Committee Orgburo expressed the greatest indignation apropos the lines: "Like Russian nature, the very soul of my people gives shelter even to a black sheep; like a bird, it nurses it." "Who is this black sheep?" Malenkov tried to find out from him. Selvinskiy was on the point of explaining the meaning of the poem, but Malenkov angrily interrupted him: "You are not driving in our whiskers!" And here the poet understood what they had in mind: An attack on Stalin, whose face was dug up by smallpox. The entry in the diary ends with the words: "I went to the session as a young man, and I left from there as a decrepit old man. My God! And these people are in charge of our culture."

Together with B. Pasternak, who had a high estimate of the poem "Rossii," at that time, in the winter of 1943-1944, I heard a detailed account from I. Selvinskiy about this session, where everyone contributed something of his own to the general abuse. One, for example, was angered by the line: "Rooks, clever ones, like peasants..." "What am I—a rook, eh?" he asked resentfully.

On this note, humorous and therefore cheerful, we conclude the subject of our discussion about the management of culture, about its invasion by people who are as little competent as they are all-permitted and self-assured.

[Question] Vyacheslav Vsevolodovich, I, most likely, will surprise you, but I admit: When I listened to you, I thought not about the Zhdanovs, not about their all-permitted licentiousness, boorishness and cruelty, I thought about those who suffered because of them, but did not permit their spinal column to bend unnecessarily, but envied into a compromise with their conscience. This is a reproach and a lesson. The self-standing which looks us in the eye and silently inquires, and you answer yourself: How do you live, with what do you agree, for what do you stand up, but perhaps you do not stand up for anything in general, then what do you do? . . . Your memory preserves so much. . . . It seems to me that you should without fail write your memoirs about people of the Great Spirit—both about Akhmatova and about Pasternak, and about. . . .

[Answer] The memoirs about Akhmatova are written and included in the collection which is timed for the 100th anniversary of her day of birth next year. About Pasternak, too, I have been writing for a long time, but I am finishing something, altering it, and I want to complete it in the near future. . . . As always, there are several things at once in the making. I am supposed to turn in a book of articles on Russian poetry, mainly of the first decades of the 20th century—from Blok and Annenskiy to Kharms approximately, to SOVETSKIY PISATEL . . . For the publishing house "Iskusstvo," I will prepare a book about Slavic mythology, and I am engaged in translations. . . .

[Question] Vyacheslav Vsevolodovich, but remember V. Shklovskiy, in discussing the writer's fate of V. Ivanov, said: ". . . The path of man should be remembered as the overcoming of obstacles." When a certain great physicist was asked what the most important thing is, what, above all, is helpful in the creation of a new theory, he answered: "Difficulties. . . ." Difficulties also advance literature. And further Shklovskiy remembers that the "Serapion Brothers" said to each other when they met: "Hello, brother, writing is difficult." But it is a misfortune, of course, if the difficulties of a creative character, internal ones, so to speak, are accompanied by external ones—obstacles of a social character. In essence, everything is better that is being printed today in the periodical literature, that has called forth and guarantees the equilibrium of an unprecedented journalistic explosion

and has been created "in spite of"—that is, the development of culture went, as it were, in two paths, which sometimes intersected: One generally recognized in our country, in the course of events, and another, which was invisible to our society. Anticipating the publication of the novel "We" in *ZNAMYA*, V. Lakshin observes: "World literature knows a multitude of utopias and anti-utopias. . . . But Zayatin became the father of a new recension of this genre, the satirical utopia of the 20th century. . . ." in whose footsteps follow already Huxley and Orwell right up to Bradbury and our *Strugatskiye*. The novel "Life and Fate" by B. Grossman, to which we today, I am not afraid to say, have fallen, it was or was not in the public consciousness? The world knew it, we practically did not know it. In literature it was not on the books, it did not figure on openlists. . . .

[Answer] I will support your arguments with the example of the sad fate of semiotics, whose successes are acknowledged throughout the world; in Western literature there even exists the term "Moscow-Tartu" or "Tartu School" of semiotics. Even though the sinister taboo has been lifted from semiotics, in practice its significance is underestimated in our country. 25 years ago, we held the first symposium on the structural study of sign systems. But the time did not favor our labors, and in Moscow they did not begin to print us and they did not permit us to organize seminars and conferences. Professor Yu. Lotman of Tartu University helped. It is striking that, given his worldwide celebrity, he is not a member of our Academy of Sciences and in the last elections he again did not become an Academician.

[Question] You also were not elected. . . .

[Answer] Our sector in the Institute of Slavic Studies and Balkanology was the first to begin work in semiotics—A. Zaliznyak, V. Toporov, and B. Uspenskiy did a great deal in this sphere. But D. Markov, the director of the institute, who now is already retired, made a mass of efforts to reduce our efforts to nought.

[Question] We propose to open a new column in *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA* called "What I Am Reading Today"—a kind of sociological spectrum: From worker to minister. And although you are not an ordinary reader—much of what has appeared in our journals in recent times, has, of course, been known to you for a long time—nevertheless allow me to begin this survey with you. What among the things you have read recently has proved to be most interesting for you?

[Answer] I would put Grossman in first place. I always cite Pushkin apropos prose: "It requires ideas and ideas. . . ."—this is the main misfortune of our literature; moreover, a clear misfortune because ideas are a complicated and dangerous thing. Grossman, whom I knew well precisely when he wrote "Zhizn i sudba," was not

afraid to think. It is a remarkable novel, and it will be a long time before we will understand it. Besides all its other and evident merits, it is of great importance as an artistic work.

From among the works with which I was not acquainted previously, the plays of Platonov struck me. His other works, which, thank heavens, have also been published. I have known for a long time. Reading Platonov today and, let us say, the published Kharms, we open up for ourselves in the literature of our homeland its conformity with world literature. What do I have in mind? For the reason that a realistic picture of Russian literature for a long time was concealed from the eyes of the reading public, it would seem: Here—the 20th century in the entire world, and there—Russian literature. Now, even if on the example of the literature of the absurd, it has become evident: This is not so. We have everything, moreover, in its highest manifestations, that is characteristic of world literature.

Incidentally, that is how it is also in poetry. An example is the little poem by Mandelshtam "Verses About an Unknown Soldier," which was published in *NOVYY MIR*. It was written in 1937, when there was no atom bomb, but the visual image of the gigantic struggle is very similar to the image of a nuclear catastrophe—a kind of prophetic vision of the poet. And in terms of its form, this poem is in the rank of the highest achievements of world poetry of the 20th century. I read a report about this in the Mandelshtam Readings at the Institute of World Literature. I intend to talk about this at a symposium devoted to the creative work of Mandelshtam, which will take place in June in Italy.

I also want to express my condemnation of the current practice of the journals: In their pages, in essence, the poetry of the young is missing. Our famous masters, I believe, are also at fault in this. Although many of them themselves experienced how difficult it is not being published, today they are not helping with sufficient energy the obscure and strange young, who have their own listeners, their own followers, but there are no printed platforms. In this sense, our journals to date do not reflect real literary activity. In painting and in music, we have already crossed this boundary, but in poetry not yet.

8970

**Writer Bykov on 'Anti-Perestroika Forces' in Belorussian Culture**  
18000432 Tallinn *SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA* in Russian 11 Jun 88 p 7

[Article by Vasil Bykov: "More Democracy, More Socialism: Our Only Chance"]

[Text] A reinterpretation of the past, whatever it may be, is always a benefit in the life of society and a necessary condition for its progressive forward movement. "A sure

way of getting smarter is to feel stupid", so folk wisdom tells us. But the fact is that a fool will never consider himself stupid, and therefore will never get smarter, especially if he does not have to. Often a fool lives better than a wise man. The latter is more often plagued by the famous "woe from worry". Over the course of many years we have become convinced that to work poorly is more profitable than to work well, that initiative is punished, that if you want to live in peace, then you have to adapt and not stand out.

However, times change, and the great, truly grandiose change in society is already seen in the fact that we have begun to talk seriously about that which is obvious, which about 10 years ago was still an act of sedition. Everything, it turns out, is relative in this world. Maybe that is good. But it is also frightening. Yes, it is frightening if society was forced to exist under conditions of limitless relativism, with law which was often directed not toward the protection of society's interests, but rather against it, and undoubtedly, certainly against the citizen, the man. The dehumanization of social life became a commonplace and everyday matter in the recent past, and this, of course, is the most grievous part of our entire past. In the name of some often fictitious or speculative ideas, life essentially turned away from its conscious bearer—man. This was skillfully used by certain forces—autocratic, totalitarian, and bureaucratic. The people grew silent, having been suppressed and having lost faith, at times thankful even for the fact that fewer of them were being imprisoned than, let us say, in '37. For this alone we were ready to love Brezhnev and to deify Khrushev, who brought back millions of unjustly imprisoned people from the Polar Circle.

How little it takes at times to be happy, we think today. But a person always strives to be a person. Anyone who is born a person, already by the very fact of his birth takes on the right to a high human fate. This is proven by the vast libraries of philosophical and literary works, by the tens if not hundreds of declarations and constitutions by peoples of the world. Man must have good conditions, then we can expect kindness from him. Otherwise it is hopeless. It is an adventuristic matter.

That is for an individual person. But what about an entire people?

The people are silent—that has long been known. The people are a blank sheet of paper on which one can write any hieroglyph. So said Mao Tse-tung quite recently.

Alas, such sentiments are not unfounded. Every people in its history has been silent and has had various hieroglyphics written on its back. It is true that the people have exhibited a stern temper, and have found defenders, primarily among the number of "eccentrics" or intellectuals, who have not kept silent and who by their very life crossed out all kinds of pretentious hieroglyphics.

Recently an extraordinary occurrence took place in the cultural life of our republic. One of our best poets, an untiring fighter for perestroika, the republic people's poet Pimen Panchenko, publicly bade farewell to his native language and ceased to write in it because the ancient Belorussian language is losing its sphere of application and becoming the "language of a narrow circle." What else is this if not the immeasurable misfortune of a nation? It is a misfortune which has befallen us certainly not in recent years, but which has matured slowly and which has had a very definite cause, called anti-democratism.

We must thank fate, which has granted us this unprecedented chance called perestroika. Society has been stirred. See how the spiritual activity of the people has risen, how the former fear of "what if something comes of this" has disappeared. What letters flood in to the newspapers, how the young people become enlivened, and how smartly and with full return the best representatives of our intelligentsia have begun to work!

However, we must admit that our Belorussian literature has been unprepared in meeting democratization and glasnost, both in a creative and in a moral sense. Moreover, some of us are inclined to be proud of that which in a broad sense we should be ashamed of. Thus, we need only mention the sentiment of one Belorussian writer and scientist who proclaimed before an audience that, not following the example of Russian literature, we never created "underground" works, works "kept in the desk." Whatever we wrote, we published. Having heard this, I thought: probably the speaker expects applause. Nevertheless, the applause did not follow. Evidently, the audience understood what our misfortune was, so as not to elevate Philistine morals to the rank of a national valor.

Yes, we, the Belorussian writers, turned out to be ill prepared for the spiritual and creative perestroika. Had it not been for the prose of B. Mikulich and A. Mriy who arose from anonymity, the poetry of P. Panchenko, and certain poems by A. Bachila and S. Grokhovskiy, at the beginning of perestroika we would have had nothing to present to the reader. However, this is understandable. For many years the example was set by those who applauded and gave "literary formulation" with their euphonic talents to the projects and resolutions born within the bureaucratic depths. It is specifically in such an atmosphere of conformism that the generation of masters of refined literature was born and flourished. They set themselves up quite nicely, and also did not forget their children, sons- and daughters-in-law, grandchildren and great-grandchildren. They did not need glasnost, nor perestroika, nor democracy. For them any cult or stagnation would do, as long as they earned the favor of the higher-ups, on whom their own success depended entirely. And let those champions of "high artistic value" not be hypocritical, as they seemingly do not "count it up" in "Children of the Arbat," "White

"Vestments" and other works which have shaken society. It is not the shortage of "high artistic value" that concerns them, but rather the downfall of Stalin's bloody prestige. Now they have become smitten with a last, senile love for the "dead lion" because they are afraid of the exposure of certain irreputable acts which they performed at one time in the name of the "living lion."

Yes, it is difficult to part with the traditions of the stagnant years in the republic, when "blind loyalty" was customarily carried out, when the philistine was revered, when they sang in chorus the praises of the powers that be, and when it was not the governing board of the Writers' Union, not M. Tank and not N. Gilevich who guided literature and determined how it was to develop. Essentially, it was various literary specialists in civilian dress who were in charge. It was specifically under them that the writers and editors, the literary specialists and critics worked for many years, trying to satisfy their tastes and demands. During the most stagnant time we were universally turned away from the "negative" and stubbornly dragged into creating the image of the positive hero, a hero to be emulated, one from whom we must learn how to build life. And at the same time our native language was in agony, our national culture and national self-consciousness were crumbling, and without them the people were becoming a kind of abstract community. The southern part of the republic suffered the consequences of Chernobyl, and at the village and city cemeteries dissonant salvos resounded over the zinc caskets of the young citizens of the republic brought in from far away. But for many of us, literary men, all this was insignificant or atypical. We tried not to think about it, let alone to write of it.

Moss-covered Stalinism and totalitarian intolerance always stand in the way of the embodiment of national fairness. Large as well as small nations suffer from this malady in equal degree. Only under conditions of democratic existence is it possible to have true respect for the interests and rights of all nations. Even the smallest of them, numbering 10 or 100 tribesmen, must have equal rights and possibilities with a great nation of many millions. The interests of the national minorities are just as sovereign as the interests of the native nationality. Disrespect or contempt in things great or small insults not only the one who has become its object, but to a lesser degree also the one from whom it emanates. In order to be respected, first you must respect the one close to you, the small and weak one—that is the primordial law of nature which, unfortunately, has not yet become an irrefutable social law.

And here I would like to note that in the atmosphere which has been formed in the republic around the great artist Marc Chagall, the question is not in the artistic manner of this master. The question is in something else: in our attitude toward our own national culture, and also in our degree of tolerance for foreigners. Therefore today, in the period of perestroika, we cannot ignore those principles with which we approach all cultural

property which, as we know, was created in far from sterile conditions of national hermetization. And this is natural. Only under conditions of mutual enrichment of cultures and currents does something valuable arise. And on the contrary: national, guild, and any other type of intolerance and limitation inevitably yield undesirable if not totally negative results. And if today we allow the devil's sabbath around Chagall, then where is the guarantee that tomorrow a similar thing will not occur in regard to any other artist, moreover "not a pure-blooded" Belorussian? If the management of the Belorussian Soviet Encyclopedia dismisses the scientific editor for his apologetics of Chagall's work, then it is quite conceivable that another editor may be dismissed for his apologetics of the creativity of Mikhail Savitskiy. "As long as there is the man, the statue will be found." This is a viable postulate, and there will always be those who are willing to apply it.

The most ruinous of man's many delusions is to think that our enemies are all those who are not like us, those who differ from us in some way. This way will always be found: by class or racial affiliation, by difference in religion or ideology, even by difference in artistic manner. We have been taught many such lessons. The many years of isolation from foreign science, culture and technology on the sole basis that they are bourgeois and therefore unacceptable for us have done great harm to our culture (as well as to science, technology and economics). Today we will need the efforts of more than one generation and a change in consciousness in order to overcome this.

Therefore, we need only broad socialist pluralism and democratization—unconditional, to the entire depth of social life, along the entire front. Democracy cannot be implemented one-quarter or one-half way with pragmatic limitations for a certain historical moment. It can viably serve society only when it encompasses everything as a whole. Otherwise, democracy will die of anemia, if it is not suffocated in the cradle. There have been ample suffocators of democracy in all times.

There are changes taking place in the country which are grandiose in their revolutionary essence. The central press is full of materials affirming socialist justice, which today is impossible without the rehabilitation of the victims of Stalinism. The people and the party have been given back tens of names of well-known leaders of culture and science and state and military leaders. The masses welcome this, and are seeing with their own eyes that perestroika is not a regular campaign of words, but that it is for real and for a long time.

And how about here in Belorussia? What are we doing in this most important matter of perestroika and in working out a new social consciousness? Or is it that we have no one to rehabilitate? Didn't we have people executed, tortured in prisons, exiled to Solovki, or sent beyond the 1000-kilometer from Belorussia? Of course, there have

been changes here too. They have returned the wonderful poet Ales Garun to our literature. Publications about the former BSSR Soviet of People's Commissars Chairman A. Kovalev, Academician A. Zhebrak, and V. Sharangovich have appeared in the press. And what else? One cannot remember offhand. However, everyone remembers the series of large-block articles in SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA, POLITICHESKIY SOBESEDNIK, and VECHERNIY MINSK—articles which cannot be called anything other than openly anti-perestroika. They contain so many protective-restorative passages, such a desire to justify the repressions and those who committed them, such a desire to besmirch the best contemporary writers and leaders of perestroika. And here is a phenomenon which is quite incredible for our time—again the Yezhov-Beria accusations against a number of Belorussian leaders of science and culture exterminated in the 30's and fully rehabilitated after the 22nd Congress have been dredged up. At the same time, the very fact of their rehabilitation is kept in secret to this day. Is this just in case? Or is it for a definite case, which is so unambiguously suggested by the well-known article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA which, by the way, the Minsk bureaucracy greeted with some enthusiasm.

We may be grateful to the editorial collective of the newspaper ZNAMYA YUNOSTI, which did not allow the reprinting of this manifesto by the anti-perestroika forces on its pages. But then I think: Maybe it's too bad that they didn't allow it. Had they reprinted it, then maybe certain cabinet secrets would have surfaced, and we would have discovered the true producers of anti-perestroika. But as it is, they have remained in the shadows and continue to act by the method of hints and allegations which, as we know, do not leave any traces in the archives.

The publicistic salvo of VECHERNIY MINSK against the meeting in defense of the Higher city and its organizers arising from an informal association cannot be termed anything other than subversive to the difficult process of democratization and a blow against perestroika. Unfortunately, I am not informed on the goals and structure of this youth association and I am not acquainted with any of its members. But I do know what it is that threatens the Higher city, a protected corner of our capital, and I am quite well informed about the management methods of the sadly known Main Architectural Planning Administration and the metro builders. I cannot help but share the well-founded concern of the youth. After all, they are the ones who will have to live in Minsk after the Glavapu members and the current city administrators are long gone, when there will be no one to answer for their "bull in the china shop" style management. Under such conditions it is easy to understand that the struggle of the youth for our historical heritage is a just and timely cause, since a 17th Century cathedral and other historic buildings in Minsk are under the threat of destruction due to the fact that a metro line has been laid under them at a shallow depth. (So as not to create a threat for a "very valuable"

administrative building which is located not far away, as the same VECHERNIY MINSK explained to its readers. And as for the cathedral, it can be demolished. There have been many of them destroyed in our land).

Yes, the anti-perestroika forces are not sleeping. They are working actively and not without some success in culture and ideology. This is evidenced by numerous facts, as well as many individual fates. An example of this is the fate of our Ales Adamovich, this clear mind in our country's literature. While he was acting openly, through means of literature and publicistics, he was being influenced by other methods. And so, having lived here his entire life, he left the republic and went to Moscow, where he headed up the All-Union Scientific-Research Institute of Cinema Art. Or here is another example. Recently the remarkable scientist Vyacheslav Stepin, who had been slighted here for many years, left Belorussia. In the capital he became not only the head of an institute, but was elected corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences. We may give other examples of this sort. People who are worthy in every respect are leaving, authoritative scientists, and people with a high level of conscience. And while the "brain drain" is in general a matter which we can generally understand, the drain of the conscience is something new in Belorussia. Nevertheless, as before people of a different ilk and different life principles flourish and set the tone for science and public life here. Enough has been written about them in the all-union press, including in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA. Who will measure the harm which they have done to our national science and to its moral reputation? Through the grace of these and certain other "leaders of science," at the end of the 20th Century, in the 70th year of its sovereign existence, the republic does not even have its own historiography, since almost everything which has been published under the signature stamp of the BSSR Academy of Science is essentially a profanation of historical science. Vulgar sociologism, a disregard for the facts, and adaptation to fashionable official conceptions at various times efface the value of even the best historical works. And if we know anything at all about our ancient and recent past, it is thanks to our amateur writers: the late V. Korotkevich, K. Tarasov, E. Yalugin, V. Yakutov, and certain professional historians who bravely stood up for the objectivity and honor of their science in the stifling atmosphere of dogmatism. These were the brothers Gritskevich, G. Galcheniko, V. Krutalevich, Z. Poznyak, and N. Tkachev. It is on them that our hopes rest today.

We are experiencing the most important, fateful period of our history, a time which will determine the further path of the country and the future of socialism. The direction in which the development of our society will go is to be largely, if not entirely, determined by our readiness for broad democratization of life, and for radical reorganization of our outdated consciousness. I would like to clarify: at least it will be determined by the readiness which we, the writers, have not yet evidenced in sufficient degree. In the years of adaptive existence,

even the best of us became too wordly wise. We learned to ponder deeply and to take no action, waiting to see what happens. And this, undoubtedly, has been a detriment to our society. But after all, the people are looking to us, and we have nowhere to retreat. History will not give us a second chance. No one will give us the gift of developing our native language, or a comfortable life, or a historiography worthy of our past. We have to earn it all ourselves—together with our people, under conditions of a true, not a paper, democracy, for which we have yet to wage a long and stubborn struggle.

12322

**Writers' Union Chief Karpov Addresses Supreme Soviet**

*18000458a Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 1 Jun 88 p 2*

[Speech by V.V. Karpov, first secretary of the board, USSR Union of Writers, USSR Supreme Soviet deputy]

*[Text] The other day the 9th session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, 11th convocation, concluded its work. We are publishing a speech given at the session by the first secretary of the board, USSR Union of Writers.*

Comrade deputies! A great many figures have been cited in Comrade Batalin's report and millions of square meters of housing space have been very generously scattered about. It is good, of course, that all these figures have been converted into real housing. If you, comrade deputies, caught a hint of doubt in my words, you would not be mistaken. And this is why. We very readily denounce the shortcomings of Stalinist times and the period of stagnation, but does it not seem to you that newborn shortcomings, to which it is time to pay attention, have already appeared in our time of restructuring as well? One such: we talk a great deal and speak enthusiastically and we adopt good resolutions, but their implementation runs up against first bureaucratism and then conservatism. Well, just who will eliminate these obstacles and when? Who, the bureaucrats and conservatives—the invisible men? No, they are not invisible men; they are chameleons. They have changed colors and shout loudly about transformations, so that they resemble the most ardent restructurers.

Here is a specific example for you from our writer's everyday reality with regard to today's discussion of housing and cultural and consumer construction. If you evaluate writers' work according to the socialist principle "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his labor," then even with all our shortcomings, of which we have many, of course, we have worked quite well on the whole for the year of perestroyka. And the writers' words are being read. The sharply increasing circulations of our journals and newspapers attests to this: NOVYY MIR tripled its circulation this year, ZNAMYA—doubled, and LITERATURNAYA GAZETA has added over a million subscribers. True, for

the time being we are writing very little about front-ranking workers deserving of popularization, about those who are giving with all their heart to the cause of transformation. This is our misfortune. Perhaps, we see no good examples? We see them. However, having abused rose-colored tints and cliched speech in the past, today writers are somewhat wary of using laudatory words and an optimistic tone even when people and their work warrant this. I believe that we will overcome this affliction.

Well, since we have worked well, then according to our labor there should be some concern about us. In February 1987, a CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree was adopted aimed at improving the activity of the creative unions. A wonderful decree! For the first time in the history of Soviet culture, such large-scale concern has been shown for workers in the arts.

Beyond this, I am forced to change my optimistic tone to a sad one. If I were to tell you that the housing problem in the writers' union worsened after this decree was passed, you probably would not believe me. Yet facts are facts. Before the decree, the Moscow Gorispolkom took 500,000 rubles annually from the Union of Writers as its share of participation in housing construction. After adoption of the decree, they crossed our column out of their plans for the future and refused to accept our money for participation in housing construction. Worse still, of the apartments already built with the money taken from us previously—we had a right to 2,000 square meters—they gave us only 500.

Imagine for the sake of comparison the following scene. You go to a tailor's, your measurements are taken and they promise to sew a suit for you within a certain period of time. You pay the money and when the suit is ready you arrive and are told, or so they say, that it has been given to someone else, and your money... too bad. This would probably not happen with a suit: the person could go to the police. But with apartments, it seems, it is possible—the money has vanished and there are no apartments. Yet this is after the decree expressing concern about supporting writers.

In 1934, as poor as we were then, the Soviet of People's Commissars nonetheless found it possible to pass a decree allocating 20 square meters of additional living space to writers as a workroom. The writer's profession is one that can be done at home: books, a desk and relative quiet are needed—these are the specific conditions for our work. A little over 50 years ago they understood these conditions, but today they refuse to understand. This decree is not being implemented.

You have all read the wonderful books by the talented writer Mikhail Alekseyev, "The Unweeping Willow," "Quarrelsome Fellows" and many others. He has been named a Hero of Socialist Labor for his work and enjoys

the well-deserved respect and attention of readers. However, certain civil servants do not want to and can in no way give the writer Alekseyev an apartment, so that he can write several more good books. Yes, Alekseyev used to have an apartment, but life goes on and happiness and misfortune at times overtake writers as well. I do not want to go into any of the particulars, but the writer Alekseyev needs help. We should give him an apartment, even if it is yet another. The more so, since the government has already acquired an income from publishing Alekseyev's books with which it would be possible, most likely, to build five palaces like this one in which we are holding our meeting.

There are two other "martyrs," though they would criticize me for that word. They are excellent writers—Mayya Ganina and Yuriy Sbitnev, husband and wife. These two have the right to both housing and working space, but they are huddled in a two-room closet, practically in an attic. They have difficulty climbing up there: neither is young and both have heart trouble. However, it is impossible to solve anything. According to metric area, those are the two rooms they have a right to and that is that, no privileges whatsoever. They do not want to be taken into special consideration for anything.

You all know of the brilliant publicist Yuriy Chernichenko, whom you have seen on television several times and whose articles you read in the newspaper. Even before restructuring he was already a true restrukturist, thanks to his bold talent. Yet this man takes shelter in such wretched living conditions that we should simply be ashamed for treating him this way. After all, he is one of our brightest contemporary publicists.

Or the writer Eduard Uspenskiy, who "invented" Cherbashka and other characters famous throughout the entire world of animated films. He is known in Japan, as well as in France and America, but he lives in a tiny little room in a communal apartment. I could cite dozens more unpleasant examples of this sort of disregard for writers in many other cities, but I am limiting myself to Moscow because this is simply ugly and intolerable for all relations in our capital. I would like to direct my criticism more accurately. It is not addressed to the Moscow Gorispolkom Chairman Comrade Saykin, with whom we have recently formed good mutual relations. However, he has an enormous amount of work: Moscow is larger than some governments in terms both of area and of population and in other parameters. Of course, Comrade Saykin cannot possibly thoroughly investigate such small, isolated matters. It is addressed precisely to people who also speak at meetings, and probably speak loudly about restructuring, and to the workers at the Moscow Gorispolkom Administration for the Accounting and Allocation of Living Space. There are not simply bureaucrats in this administration but moss-covered inhabitants, who can respond to the writers' union's requests on the subject of the aforementioned housing misfortunes not with a practical solution of the problem, but with insults.

Allow me to dwell upon cultural construction. This is not only the construction of buildings. I believe that, in general, this is the construction of culture. The greatest bottleneck in this area is the publishing business. Typographic capabilities and paper are inadequate. The demand upon our production is growing, while the possibilities of meeting this demand are diminishing. Polygraphy is becoming obsolete and the paper crisis is not being resolved. We are seeking and finding ways, albeit few, to expand our publishing possibilities. Here as well, however, bureaucratism, inertia and sluggishness are a true barrier in our path.

Yet another example: over a year ago, Soviet writers and Finnish publishers discovered each other as partners. We have literature, which is now drawing worldwide interest and attention, and the Finns have paper and typography. It was agreed to produce 120 books annually in five languages—English, German, French and others. We would split the profits. Well, is this such a bad idea—promoting 120 Soviet books in the West? This is not just a matter of money, but of our peace-loving policy, our art, culture, renovation and so forth. So, what was the result? We, the Soviet writers, selected worthy books and the Finnish companies prepared the paper and typography and wrote the text of the agreement. Representatives of both sides threateningly raised pens in order to sign this mutually beneficial undertaking. Then the sticky little hands of the bureaucrat seized us in this threatening gesture. Who gave permission? Who did you consult with? Are you a legitimate foreign-trade payer? This casuistry has already gone on for over a year. Today I still do not know where, right now, on which shelf or in which pigeon-hole our documents, explanations and reports on this matter are lying. In general, good business has been buried under red tape and we have been embarrassed in front of the Finnish companies. This is how we structure some of our cultural affairs.

Comrade deputies! Perhaps we should seek out and apply some new forms of our deputy activity under the conditions of restructuring? Perhaps even on the facts which I have cited. Let us create a small deputy commission of three people and instruct them to investigate—it will only take 2 or 3 hours, even with travel time. The Administration for the Accounting and Allocation of Housing Space is not far from here. Let the deputies go there and ask: how come you are not fulfilling the Central Committee and Council of Ministers decree? Let them ask just that one question. It seems to me that this form of active deputy interference could be used not only in our writers' affairs but also in others, wherever obstacles and barriers are being erected in the path of restructuring.

Perhaps this is a bit off the subject, but, speaking of seeking out new forms of work, I would like to share some thoughts with you on this, the more so since we are working together for the last year: elections will be held at the beginning of next year for the new Supreme Soviet members. At our sessions, I always regard the deputies

with admiration—each of us has great experience, knowledge and energy. However, it seems to me, we are not fully utilizing our possibilities. We amiably voted to pass important laws—this is good. However, do you not see some sort of connection with the past, as we say, with the administrative style of work, in this monolithic unanimity?

Today we speak of socialist pluralism and seek out forms of its manifestation, yet the Supreme Soviet was directly set up as two chambers: the Council of the Union and the Council of Nationalities. Somehow, however, I do not recall even a single discussion between our chambers. It goes without saying that we should not artificially whip up such debates—this serves no purpose—but in our searches for truth, for the best solutions to numerous contemporary problems, it would be possible to argue and search both in the chambers as well as between the chambers.

I will tell you what I saw in the English Parliament, not so that it can be copied, but simply for your information and thought. Twice weekly in the Parliament, on Tuesdays and Thursdays, Prime Minister Thatcher and the one who was prime minister before her answer the questions of Parliament members. If we had a similar system, Comrade Ryzhkov and his deputies and ministers would be able to react quickly to all deputy questions asked on behalf of their constituents. Then, perhaps, even those examples which I noted above would be resolved within several days. Yet another detail. The country's citizens can attend the English Parliament meetings on the balconies and in the mezzanine and watch how their Parliament works. This is how they popularize their democracy.

Moreover, it seems to me, we should think about greater democratization in the election of deputies. We ought to elect more deputies from those who live among their constituents, who know their lives and concerns and participate in their daily affairs, whose ties with constituents would be closer and more fruitful. There are many such deputies within our Supreme Soviet, but there are also no few such as I. I am a deputy from Rostov Oblast, yet I live in Moscow. Of course, I am grateful to Sholokov's fellow countrymen from Veshenskiy Station and to the "Rostselmash" workers for the fact that they voted for me as their deputy, but nonetheless I must make trips to see them and it is also difficult for them to visit me in Moscow. Obviously, there should be government leaders in the Supreme Soviet—this is natural and necessary. However, the majority of deputies should nonetheless be chosen from among those who live and work with the people. (Applause).

### **Uzbek Film Scored For Sympathetic View of Stalin**

*18000458b Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 1 Jun 88 p 8*

[Review by Rostislav Pospelov of the film "The Meaning of Life: " "On an Old Watch"]

[Text] The jury of the All-Union Film Festival recently held in Baku gave the film "The Meaning of Life" an award "for the development of an important civic theme." This decision, to put it mildly, evoked surprise.

It so happened that I was late to the contest showing of "The Meaning of Life" and saw it the next evening at an outlying Baku movie theater, where, 2 minutes before the beginning, I turned out to be the only viewer. The theater workers, who had been legitimately considering going home early—after all, not a single ticket had been sold!—were disappointed but hospitable and even invited several boys in off the street to keep me company. These did not stay long, and then, it seems, the cashier's husband and the film operator's father arrived... In a word, we could not complain about crowdedness and no audience uproar regarding the "important civic theme" was observed.

This is a lengthy, two-part film devoted to Usman Yusupov, who headed the Uzbek party organization from September 1937 to the early 1950s. The son—Ulmas Yusupov—played his father.

Comrade Stalin (played by G. Saakyan) was one of the main heroes of the film. The interior of his office is carefully set up, and the external likeness of his closest comrades-in-arms is carefully adjusted (in principle: his retinue also "plays" king), but the main point is that, with all possible effort, the image of a strict but just Father is created. Stalin voiced both patriotic orders to Yusupov, and a warning, also patriotic, that was beyond endearment: "You have only one party card, Usman Yusupovich..."

It goes on. The war began. In order to feed the hundreds of thousands of people evacuated to Uzbekistan, the Central Committee first secretary decided to plant part of the irrigated land designated for cotton in grain. He took responsibility himself. The Politburo strictly reprimanded him and the Central Asian curator Andrey Andreyevich Andreyev was indignant: "It is plainly obvious arbitrariness, cotton is a most important strategic raw material." However, Comrade Stalin would not have been the life-giving foundation of this film if he had simply let Yusupov off with a reprimand.

**Stalin. What time is it, Usman Yusupovich?**

**Yusupov. Forgive me, Comrade Stalin, I do not have a watch.**

**Stalin. Take mine. It will prove useful to you in your further work.**

The film's hero will be checking the time on Stalin's watch for his entire life.

Somebody from the Uzbek film management, speaking at the festival's "free tribunal" (having very unequivocally evaluated "The Meaning of Life," they even compared it with the sadly famous article by N. Andreyeva), agreed with the fact that the film should not be entered in the contest but found nothing terrible in it. It is not a matter of Stalin, they say, but of the fact that today it is so important for us to show the people a brilliant, strong personality, a leader of the masses—the selfless fighter for the idea of socialism.

Actually, it is also a matter of Yusupov.

I shall quote a recent article in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA by Yu. Manayenkov, first secretary, Lipetsk CPSU Obkom: "...there are people who, following Stalin, are prepared to idealize anything, who in those days were privy to party and state policy, to the fates of their fellow citizens: 'authoritative,' 'knew how to lead,' 'words are worthless'... But is it so? Authority? Or perhaps, more frequently, fear? Ordering, punishing and persecuting have become the main and most 'authoritative' instrument of upbringing."

The film's consultants, doctors of historical sciences Kh. Tursunov and L. Yusupov, could not have failed to know about this cult of the little god, which had developed under the protection of the cult of the great god.

Either they are pretending or they truly do not understand that the roots of Rashidovism are the corruption and moral degeneration of a significant part of the state and party apparatus in Uzbekistan—they originate precisely during the time of the "disinterested man," Yusupov, and they were created by autocratic lack of control, by terrible violations of socialist legality. Even Rashidov himself was in many ways obliged to Yusupov for his career, since under Yusupov he was made secretary of Samarkand Obkom and assigned to the most responsible position of editor in chief of the republic party newspaper. Sharaf Rashidovich did not emphatically praise his former boss without reason (when this was still no threat to anyone—when it was, he preferred to hold his tongue).

The film simply avoids all circumstances related to the unexpected selection of the republic's people's commissar of the food industry as Central Committee first secretary. However, one evening Yusupov's wife asks him: "Tell me, do you believe that Akmal Ikramov is an enemy? Fayzulla Khodzhayev also—tell me, do you believe this?" Yusupov only sighs.

It would be surprising for him not to sigh. On 20 September 1937 Andreyev spoke at the Uzbek Central Committee Plenum, having arrived with a high order to

denounce the ardent Leninist Akmal Ikramov and others of the best communists as "enemies of the people." The only one of the republic's leadership who supported these defamatory accusations proved to be the people's commissar of the food industry, Usman Yusupov. Somewhere in the archives even today is stored Ikramov's note from that plenum: "Dear comrades, do you really believe this?..."

All of this is not easy. The system for creating gods and little gods has functioned with the precision of a well-tuned mechanism, and quite intelligent, profoundly respectable people have given in to it. Let us recall the novel by Nikolay Biryukov, "The Waters of the Naryn." Konstantin Simonov wrote about Yusupov with open good will in his diaries "The Various Days of War," and he was impressed by the rigid self-confidence, resolute pressure and practical acumen of this person. Konstantin Mikhaylovich, a man of his time, was honest before himself and his readers. However, to be touched by a similar style of work now, and moreover to give credit to one personality for that which in the days of war and peace had been achieved by the incredible exertion of the force of the entire Uzbek people, is at the very least immoral.

The movie depicts the construction of the Great Fergan Canal in an entirely traditional manner. Mass enthusiasm, a hoe in the first secretary's hands and his participation in quick planning sessions; finally, as an apotheosis, the dance by Tamara Khanum before the streams of running water. Did this happen? It did. The Great Fergan is justifiably called the Uzbek Magnitka. In one and a half months, 170,000 people manually dug 270 kilometers of canal. However, it would do the authors of the film no harm to look from the past into our time: how that mass enthusiasm began to be unconsciously exploited over the years, how the hands of the Uzbek peasant as before are substituting for large- and small-scale mechanization in the cotton fields.

When Yezhov's assistant Apresyan, the people's commissar of internal affairs of Uzbekistan, tells Yusupov in the movie that a case has been filed against the land reclamation specialist-professor "based on report," he hears the heartfelt response: "On what kind of report?" Yet the first secretary could have repeated words from his speech at the conclusion of that tragic year of 1937: "Carry on, glorious workers of the people's commissariat of internal affairs, your successful struggle with the enemies of the people in the same way as you have performed it to this time."

The infuriated Yusupov hurls melons at the rayon leader, who was luxuriating at the height of the working day in a cool irrigation canal, and then curtly demands: "Your party card!... You are no enemy, you are worse than an enemy..." This analogy with recent days is broken by his signature on the death sentences of thousands of honest communists, whom these scoundrels arrived to replace. Yusupov himself selected them.

In the finale of his leadership career he voices thoughts from the screen which somehow directly relate to the present: "The homeland needs not percentages, but cotton. We have exhausted the soil, the land has become infertile... how will it answer those who come after us? Our children and grandchildren?" One can find the direct opposite in the shorthand of those years. We are inspired not simply with sympathy, but also with pity, with compassion for the hero. A certain responsible comrade is explaining his release from a high position by an overly cautious attitude toward that narrow space between the cotton rows. Enough! Could this formal

reason have fooled anyone even then? Time released him. Stalin's watch stopped.

This film is 40 years behind the times. The question of how it could appear today and what forces in the republic promoted its creation requires a special investigation. I myself have tried simply to discover: what led the jury to give it an award and were there any conflicts of opinion? I received the answer: the jury did not discuss this award.

13362

**USSR Procuracy Sets New Tasks in Restructuring**  
18000402 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA  
ZAKONOST in Russian No. 4.  
Apr 88 (signed to press 6 Apr 88) pp 11-17

[Article, under the rubric "How Party Decisions Are Carried Out": "Concrete Deeds and Vigorous Actions toward Restructuring"; first three paragraphs are source introduction]

[Excerpts] On 5 February of this year an expanded session of the collegium of the USSR Procuracy was held with participation by procurators of the Union and autonomous republics, krays, and oblasts, plus military and transport procurators. Progress in restructuring the activity of procuracy organs in light of the demands of the June 1987 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and the CPSU Central Committee decree entitled "Measures to Enhance the Role of Procuracy Supervision in Strengthening Socialist Legality and Order" was reviewed.

Participants in the work of the collegium included V. Terebilov, Chairman of the USSR Supreme Court; A. Vlasov, USSR Minister of Internal Affairs; N. Malshakov, Chief State Arbiter of the USSR; V. Abolentsev, deputy chief of the Department of Administrative Organs of the CPSU Central Committee; F. Bobkov, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Security; A. Romantsov, deputy chairman of the USSR Peoples Control Committee; V. Gubarev, deputy USSR minister of justice; and important officials of the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Court, and the USSR Council of Ministers.

The report was presented by USSR Procurator General A. Rekunov.

It was emphasized at the collegium that major organizational steps have been taken in procuracy organs in execution of the 4 June 1987 decree of the CPSU Central Committee: conceptions were worked out and orders of the USSR Procurator General were revised for the main areas of supervisory activity; the subject principle is being introduced in organizing work; the program for raising qualifications has been completely revised; and the most significant questions of updating the style and methods of work and supervisory practices were reviewed at the cluster seminars with city and rayon procurators which were held in all the Union republics.

At the same time the report and the statements of participants indicated that there has not yet been a decisive change in the quality, style, and forms of work. This is convincingly illustrated by trips to the local areas and the numerous letters of working people, especially coming from Azerbaijan, Armenia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, many oblasts of the Ukraine, Krasnodar and Stavropol krays, Rostov Oblast, Dagestan and Komi ASSR's, and other places.

Primary attention was focused on how to refashion general supervisory practices and give them the ability to vigorously encourage the elimination of factors that give rise to deviations and retreats from the law. This is especially important today, when the position of those who like an atmosphere of waste and mismanagement is under pressure, but far from completely undermined. Among other things it was observed that despite the fact that 40 percent of theft cases occur in agriculture, many procurators in Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan, Moldavia, and Armenia are not trying to go deeply into the causes of this widespread distribution, but rather search for ways to uncover specific cases. Measures to make the specific persons at fault pay for losses caused are still extremely rare.

The process of normalization of the economy is impossible without firmly rooting out report-padding and deception. In a number of republics, krays, and oblasts we again and again encounter recurrences of this shameful, antistate practice. In recent times cases of report-padding in construction and numerous instances of accepting residential buildings with serious flaws have been uncovered.

The authority of the procuracy and legality has been greatly harmed by the formerly existing idea that starting a case is virtually the optimal result of general supervisory work. But 57 percent of the report-padding cases are dropped for lack of the elements of the crime or lack of an event. The instigation and investigation of such cases demands a balanced and objective approach.

Strengthening discipline in transportation is a matter of great state importance. All procurators must draw lessons from the accidents that have occurred recently on the railroads, in maritime and river transportation, and in aviation. This means above all rigorous adherence to the rules of traffic safety and strengthening discipline in all sectors. The problems of freight preservation and railroad car downtime remain serious. A recent inspection of the Northern Transportation Procuracy showed that its work is on an extremely low level. Many transportation procurators are not striving for end results.

The collegium sternly warned transportation procurators that they are personally responsible for compliance with legality and state discipline in transportation.

Improving environmental protection is a task of enormous importance. The continuing contamination of the land, water, and atmosphere has greatly complicated the ecological situation. In many regions the situation has become so threatening that it is causing harm to human health.

We must recognize that not even the USSR Procuracy grasped the full urgency of these matters promptly. Procuracy measures did not slow down the negative processes. I. Lumpov, procurator of Perm Oblast, was sharply criticized for poor organization of work in this sector.

In January the party and government adopted a decree on a radical restructuring of environmental protection work in the country. The USSR State Committee for Environmental Protection was formed and all procurators must establish working relations with its local organs and develop a clear program for procurator supervision. A specific challenge being posed—monitor problem sites everywhere and strive for tangible, quick results in stopping contamination of atmospheric air, water, and land.

There is no more important and pressing challenge for procurators today than effective and productive supervision of implementation of the Law on the State Enterprise.

The key problem of restructuring the economic mechanism is rigorous observation of contract discipline by enterprises. Short deliveries disrupt production and threaten fulfillment of the state plan. The procuracy should firmly and decisively defend the interests of the enterprises, which suffer enormous losses from failure to make contract deliveries.

Many procurators, however, show completely unjustified passivity, do not consider this sector a key direction of their activity, and are not establishing contacts with arbitration tribunals and other monitoring organs.

Analysis shows that in many sectors the bad situation is created by the 7-10 percent of the enterprises where underdeliveries have become a chronic phenomenon. This is where supervisory efforts should be concentrated. Many signals have been received recently about violations of enterprise rights, but the procuracy still is not active in protesting unlawful enactments. It should become a rule for all procurators, when checking the legality of the activity of management organs, to visit their subordinate enterprises. This is the approach that makes it possible to identify and eliminate illegal decisions that infringe on the rights of labor collectives.

Orders should be used more broadly to strengthen legality in economic activity. When they are used skillfully they achieve their result. The shipment of poor-quality output was stopped in the Moldavian SSR by procurator's order, while in Kursk Oblast measures were taken to prevent the spoilage of grain stored under improper conditions, and in the city of Gagra the operation of a toxic chemical and mineral fertilizer storehouse in the middle of a residential area was stopped.

Today as never before procurator actions must be given publicity [glasnost]. Direct appeals to the population, "direct" telephones, regular columns in newspapers, photo exhibits, and appearances on radio and television arouse considerable public response. These forms of glasnost are being used skillfully in Latvia, Moscow, Leningrad, Kiyubyshev, Sverdlovsk, and many other

places. At the same time many false rumors are sometimes generated when procurator inspections are conducted and the results are not made public or internal decisions are made not to institute criminal charges or to drop cases. Glasnost and timely information to the public make it possible to activate the enormous potential of working collectives to really eliminate the causes of violations of legality. Without this we cannot talk about effective work or restructuring in general.

The report of the USSR Procurator General emphasized the fact that procurators recently have focused on the economy and relaxed their attention to defending the rights and lawful interests of citizens. The number of substantiated appeals against unlawful discharges and other violations of labor law is not decreasing. Many critical signals are being received of violations of the laws on distribution of housing. In Voronezh Oblast intervention of the procuracy resulted in the identification and assignment to persons on waiting lists of 400 apartments which had been empty for a considerable time, while 150 persons who were improperly considered to be in need of improved housing were removed from waiting lists. But we still do not see this kind of activism in defense of citizens' rights everywhere, although it is a key element of restructuring.

In the Azerbaijan SSR employees of the USSR Procuracy encountered flagrant violations of citizens' rights and even arbitrary actions by officials and instances of bureaucratism within the procuracy itself.

It is very important now to change as quickly as possible to the procedure established by Order No 77 of the USSR Procurator General for resolving citizen's letters, petitions, and complaints, to eliminate the multiple stages in reviewing and deciding them, and to strictly define the framework of responsibility of all the procurators who are assigned to make these decisions.

The USSR Procuracy continues to receive many critical signals of poor work by criminal law organs in protecting public order, preventing domestic crimes, and uncovering apartment theft and other crimes.

Flagrant violations of legality in reviewing petitions and communications on crimes that have been committed were discovered in Moscow and Karaganda Oblasts. Cases are not instituted promptly, they have concealed cases of theft from the records, and criminals remain undiscovered. It is absolutely intolerable that in almost 2,000 homicide cases the city and rayon procurators did not go to the scene of the crime, and the permanent operational investigative groups were used in only one-third of the homicides committed without witnesses. It is difficult to count on maintenance of firm public order where there is such an attitude.

**There has not been a fundamental turning point in overcoming drunkenness, parasitism, drug addiction, and recidivism as the primary factors that determine the state of criminal activity.**

We cannot fail to see that the heat of the fight against drunkenness has cooled in many places recently. The principal threat to the anti-alcohol policy is the spread of home-brewing; the fight against it is not appropriate to the critical situation. Last year there was no confiscation of property at all for those convicted of selling home-brewed alcohol in the Uzbek SSR, the Mari ASSR, Maritime Kray, and Kalinin, Ulyanovsk, and a number of other oblasts. In Moldavia and Tyumen Oblast criminal law organs are working in a disorganized fashion and have not involved the main forces—the community and labor collectives—in the fight.

**The positive changes in fighting the parasitic way of life still have not become stable and consistent in many places.** More than half of the persons charged had not worked for at least 4 months before receiving the official warning, and one out of three had not worked for several years. It is recommended that the Lipetsk experience in preventing and stopping this negative phenomenon be applied more broadly.

A national system of job placement, retraining, and vocational guidance for the population is being set up in conformance with the decree of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers, and the AUCCTU entitled "Ensuring Effective Employment of the Population, Improving the Job Placement System, and Strengthening Social Guarantees for Working People." The potential of the new structures must be used vigorously in this work.

**The level of the fight against recidivism does not meet current demands.** For example, in Kursk and Belgorod Oblasts where last year no work at all was done on these matters, recidivism increased. But in Tula Oblast where a program has been in effect for more than 2 years it declined from 30 to 20 percent.

**The CPSU Central Committee pointed to extremely unsatisfactory performance of tasks on correction and re-education of convicts.** The fundamental restructuring of prosecutor supervision of compliance with the law in carrying out penalties demands direct participation in educational measures, active use of orders and other prosecutor powers to strengthen legality in corrective labor institutions, and an increase in the role of supervision to prevent recidivism.

**One of the most important tasks of restructuring is making the activity of the investigative apparatus more effective.** Serious shortcomings in its work have come into sharp conflict with the policy of democratization, disturb broad strata of the public, and arouse sound criticism in the press. Many cases of unobjective investigation and unsubstantiated criminal charges against

citizens and convictions have been uncovered during inspections in Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Lithuania, Latvia, and Turkmenistan. Krasnodar, Krasnoyarsk, and Maritime krays, Rostov Oblast, and a number of oblasts in the Ukraine.

The reason for this is a simplistic, one-sided approach to investigating the evidence, disregard of procedural law and the guarantees of individual rights, poor organization of supervision, formalistic management of investigative work, and poor performance discipline. The Odessa case is well-known and sad: many people monitored it, but they did not notice or stop either the falsification of evidence or unlawful methods.

Procurators must carry out supervision of the investigation in a competent manner so that all violations of the law are revealed in time. Every procuracy needs to work out a precise system of timely identification and prevention of violations of legality, with an emphasis on substantiation for instituting the criminal case, presentation of the indictment, selection of the means of ensuring appearance in court, and submission of the file to the court.

It cannot be considered normal when a broad sector of supervision—administrative practices of the MVD—is outside the jurisdiction of procurators. Many complaints are received against actions by employees of the State Vehicle Inspectorate, sobering-up stations, and the passport service. Procurator supervision of the legality of activities by internal affairs organs must decisively reject formalism, obsession with documents, and multiple reports, and work more on concrete steps to eliminate violations.

It has been possible in recent years to somewhat reduce the use of the penalty of loss of freedom by the courts. But in a matter as important as setting the penalty there should not be concern for quantitative indicators. Only individualization of responsibility and consideration of all the circumstances of the case and the personality of the defendant can determine the social justice of the penalty.

The subdivisions that carry out supervision over court hearings of criminal cases must become a kind of state acceptance commission which will not let a single poorly investigated and poorly conducted trial by the court pass.

**Fundamental restructuring in procuracy organs is impossible without qualitative renewal of personnel.** One-third of the Union republic procurators have been replaced and one out of four kray and oblast procurators is new.

Eighty percent of the managers of the city and rayon element are working their first term of constitutional authority. Therefore, a paramount challenge today should be to educate and retrain personnel. The focus should be on practical education and developing the

ability to think broadly and independently, apply progressive methods of work organization, raise general and legal sophistication, and persistently root out conceitedness, intoxication with power, and indifference to people.

Economic education has begun. It is considered especially important today. The inspections showed that there are different attitudes toward this matter. Economic training is organized on a planned basis in Grodno, Kharkov, and Leningrad oblasts, combined with vocational education and based at respectable economics VUZes; managers of economic organs are involved. But in Poltava Oblast everything has been allowed to drift, and they are working on secondary matters. Procurator A. Roshchin of Kursk Oblast, procurator S. Gadzhimagomedov of the Dagestan ASSR, and a number of other procuracy executives have been criticized for poor work with personnel.

To correct the situation we must firmly end the behind-closed-doors approach in personnel work, and enhance the role and prestige of certification. Active participation by party organizations must be ensured for nominations to the reserve, appointments, and cases of awarding incentive. And this is not just to avoid mistakes, but also to create an atmosphere of mutual high standards and principles and openness.

**The focus of all organizational measures must be practical assistance to the city and rayon elements, freeing procurators from pointless and unnecessary work, liberating them from the grips of localism, and giving them a chance to work with initiative and independence.**

But still, in the Ukraine and Azerbaijan the activity of city and rayon procuracies continues to be programmed from above. Multiple inspections generally amount to nothing but a search for negative material. The collegium of the LiSSR Procuracy did not adopt a single concrete compulsory measure aimed at helping city and rayon procurators for a year.

Lack of communication among sectorial administrations and departments and failure to accept new developments are seriously hindering the introduction of the new style. It is not accidental that the subject principle is being introduced so timidly. Stagnation is also seen in the attitude toward progressive know-how. Introduction of scientific principles is under-estimated.

Organizational langor and the lack of initiative on the part of certain oblast, kray, and republic procuracy collegiums is leading to a situation where restructuring in reality has not even begun in many city and rayon procuracies, and in some oblast ones.

The work of the USSR Procuracy apparatus was criticized in this connection. The organizational monitoring administration does not take notice in time and does not set the tone in improving the style of work, monitoring,

and inspecting performance. Formalism and monitoring on paper only do not permit the main investigative administration to be raised to the proper organizational level either.

Active preparation is underway for the 19th all-Union party conference, which will be a major political event in the life of our party and society. The review of progress in restructuring is becoming more and more exacting. Attention is concentrated on the questions of stepping up the fight against phenomena that are retarding the positive processes evoked by restructuring, democratization, and glasnost. Therefore, **restructuring in procuracy organs should grow vigorously in breadth and depth, and the initiative and energy of procuracy employees should be directed to achieving concrete results in strengthening socialist legality and legal order.**

Copyright: "Sotsialisticheskaya zakonnost," 1988.

11176

#### **Readers View Law on Appealing Unlawful Official Actions**

18000456 Moscow SOVETSKAYA YUSTITSIYA ir.  
Russian No

9 May 88 (signed to press 26 Apr 88) pp 14-15

[Interview with the RSFSR Ministry of Justice's Public Information Department Chief D. Gorodetskiy by special correspondent A. Kuznetsov: "Under the Conditions of Glasnost" under the "Our Interviews" rubric; first paragraph is a boldface introduction]

**[Text] On January 1, 1988, the USSR Law on Rules of Appealing in Court Unlawful Actions of Officials Violating the Rights of Citizens came into force. Has concern over the implementation of this law manifested itself in letters from citizens? This is the question our special correspondent A. Kuznetsov asked the RSFSR Ministry of Justice's Public Information Department Chief D. Gorodetskiy.**

**[Answer]** Many letters from the public ask us to explain articles of this law. It is also clear that the new responsibilities of the courts stemming from the law have made employees of the courts and justice organizations realize the high degree of responsibility that they bear for organizing correctly and precisely the work with citizens' written and oral reports. The idea is to make sure that these reports are considered and decisions reached in a timely, thorough and substantive manner, at the very first request. This should also be based on the party directive that the broader and deeper the democracy, the stronger the socialist legality and law and order.

**[Question]** David Grigoryevich, we have been living under the conditions of glasnost for some time now. This, of course, has made citizens more active and intolerant of faults. Have you noticed this in the work of your department?

[Answer] Yes, of course. In 1987 alone, the number of letters, reports and complaints that fall into our ministry's area of competence rose by almost 7 percent. Most of them, or about 70 percent, dealt with questions directly related to the work of the courts. Most complaints and reports came from Moscow and Leningrad, from Moscow, Tyumen, Rostov and Voronezh oblasts, from Krasnodar, Krasnoyarsk and Stavropol krais and from the Dagestan ASSR.

[Question] Are many of them founded?

[Answer] About 30 percent.

[Question] Quite a few. How do you explain this?

[Answer] I think that there are several reasons. First, some young judges are not competent enough yet; they lack practical experience. Only last year elections to the people's courts were held and there are many new judges on the bench.

Also, to be honest, instances of indifferent, callous attitudes still occur. For instance, citizen Yakusheva has complained about the actions of the people's judge at Krasnodar's Prikubanskiy Rayon Court N. Bogdanov. Instead of ruling quickly in her suit whereby she asked a transportation company for damages for an injury, the judge decided that the case should be heard in the district where the defendant resides, at Smolensk Oblast's Vyazma City Court. Yet, I would like to emphasize that Bogdanov knew that the plaintiff had become fully incapacitated as a result of the work-related injury and could not walk. From Vyazma, the case was correctly returned to Krasnodar, where the plaintiff resides. After a 9-month delay Yakusheva's suit was decided in her favor. Is it possible that comrade Bogdanov does not feel pangs of conscience?

[Question] Incidentally, David Grigoryevich, are there many complaints about delays in court, about violations of the law?

[Answer] Yes, unfortunately. Here is a typical one: a complaint by citizen R. Klintsova describing significant mistakes related, in particular, to delays in hearing her civil suit by the people's judge of Groznyi's Oktyabrskiy Rayon City Court M. Izmaylov. Appropriately enough, the judge was consequently disciplined along both professional and party lines.

Complaints are also common about judges disregarding Article 129 of the RSFSR State Professional Code when refusing to hear suits. The reasons for refusals have not always been provided, and no required explanations have been given how to appeal the decision or eliminate obstacles to bringing the suit.

This was the cause of complaints against the following people's judges: O. Gosteva, at Voronezh Oblast's Ros-soshanskiy Rayon Court and L. Lyubimtsev and A.

Gubantsev, at Moscow Oblast's Balashikha City Court, as well as against several judges in Moscow, in Lipetsk and Kuybyshev oblasts and in the Bashkir and Checheno-Ingush ASSRs.

Legitimate ire is aroused among members of the public by court delays in hearing cases and implementing court decisions, especially in suits dealing with child support payments. Such complaints comprise over 50 percent of those from the Buryat, Mordovian and Checheno-Ingush ASSR, from Altai, Krasnodar, Krasnoyarsk and Khabarovsk krais and from Irkutsk, Kemerovo, Magadan, Tyumen and Chita oblasts.

Legitimate complaints came when the interests of the victim, her lawyers and other participants of the trial were ignored by the people's judge of Moscow Oblast's Ramenskiy Rayon Court Yu. Korolyeva in the case of Belyakov and others, accused under Article 117, Paragraph 3, of the RSFSR Criminal Code. During the June 25, 1987, hearing—there had been seven hearings before that—over which Korolyeva presided, the hearings were postponed for full 3 months when a witness failed to appear. This was done over the objections of the trial's participants. Here is another example: the people's judge of Lipetsk's Sovetskiy Rayon Court A. Shmakova delayed for 7 months hearing citizen Shuster's suit whereby she asked for changes in the lease and the exchange of residence contract to be annulled. There are also other examples.

[Question] And how about implementation of court decisions? How well do judges and court presidents supervise bailiffs?

[Answer] Not very well, unfortunately, in many cases. Facts, as they say, speak for themselves. This one, for instance: the court president of Tambov Oblast's Michurinskiy Rayon Court A. Yekimov and people's judge V. Savinkova long delayed enforcing implementation of the court decision in a suit by Zaytsev concerning repairs in a residential building. For a full year the plaintiff's complaints at various levels produced no actions either by the court or the defendant—until, that is, the building's walls collapsed. Only after that measures were taken to implement the court decision.

The people's judge of Sverdlovsk Oblast's Nizhneturyinsk City Court V. Fyedulov acted irresponsibly in a suit brought by citizen Mikhaylov seeking to collect support payments from his son. The papers were submitted to him on November 24, 1986, but no action was taken until May 1987. And even though the court ruled in this case on May 11, the decision was not implemented for another 2 months. This was the fault of the bailiff of the same court, Ye. Komarova.

The bailiff of Stavropol Kray's Stepanovskiy Rayon Court Ye. Danilchenko, with the court president V. Shvets providing no supervision, acted extremely irresponsibly in implementing the court decision in a suit by

citizen Nuroyeva who sought her reinstatement as a milkmaid as well as back wages for a period of forced absence from work. In early December 1986, they sent to the kolkhoz the court order and did not follow up to see whether or not it was implemented. As a result, the order was lost. Following Nuroyeva's complaint, a duplicate was sent to the kolkhoz on May 28, 1987, but was not executed. Only after another complaint by Nuroyeva, at the request of the RSFSR Ministry of Justice, the case was heard on July 31, 1987, at the board meeting of the krayispolkom justice department; the plaintiff was reinstated on the very same day and her back wages were paid. In all of these cases those responsible were disciplined.

[Question] Violations of the law and delays could be avoided, couldn't they, if administrators of people's courts and justice departments properly supervised court employees and stopped abuses of the law in a timely and principled manner?

[Answer] Undoubtedly. It has not yet become an unbreakable rule throughout the justice system, in the courts, etc. to implement the order of the CPSU Central Committee as well as articles of the laws and regulations demanding effective measures to eliminate practices leading to complaints.

For example, the court president of Murmansk Oblast's Kirov City Court Ye. Tarasov disregarded for 6 months numerous requests of citizen Lukyanova to enforce accelerated implementation of the professional committee's order to management to rescind an illegal fine. This forced Lukyanova to appeal to the Murmansk obispolkom justice department. Department head B. Yurin, while getting the illegal order rescinded, did not take required actions to discipline the court president who was guilty in the delay. All this got the RSFSR Ministry of Justice involved in a correspondence with Lukyanova.

The justice departments of the Ryazan and Orel obispolkoms paid no attention to the fact that inspections of the implementation of court decisions at city enterprises, organizations and offices were always fruitless, even though there had been many complaints about poor or inadequate enforcement of payment of child support. Nonetheless, justice departments in these and other oblasts and krays inspect bailiffs' work in following Paragraph 115 of the Rules of Court Order Implementation infrequently and superficially, without bringing to light existing shortcomings.

[Question] Judging from the letters and telephone calls even to the offices of this publication, it seems that in the field, at justice departments, notary public offices and legal advice offices, people do not always get clear answers to their questions, and sometimes they are even encouraged to appeal to higher authorities. Is it true?

[Answer] Yes, unfortunately. It is not an accident that the number of citizens asking to be seen by higher authorities, as you say—at the RSFSR Ministry of Justice, for instance—rose 10 percent last year. Half of the complaints presented during those meetings were ruled founded.

Citizens often report that justice departments and organizations, as well as the courts, violate the rules of seeing the public established by the order of the Ministry of Justice RSFSR. This has taken place in Sakhalin, Volograd, Kamchatka and Moscow oblasts, as well as in other areas.

In many letters citizens complain about rudeness and tactlessness among justice professionals and bias of judges toward some participants of the trial. This, of course, is unacceptable.

[Question] What is being done to rectify the situation?

[Answer] On this subject, the Board of the RSFSR Ministry of Justice passed a special resolution on March 15 of this year. In particular, it pointed out the need to strive for complete and thorough investigation of every report, provide exhaustive and well-argumented answers and take measures to eliminate the identified shortcomings.

We must make constant efforts to raise the level of professional competence of those who investigate complaints and petitions of citizens and see citizens in person.

By June 1, 1988, we must carefully consider the reasons why people complain about actions of justice entities and the courts and, based on this analysis, take additional measures to improve the quality, precision and timeliness of their activities. Attention must be concentrated on redressing violated rights and legitimate interests of citizens and eliminating conditions that give rise to most complaints, especially repeated ones.

Improvements are also needed in supervising the process whereby reports on court-related problems are investigated. The problems also include those related to the functioning of notary public and defense lawyer offices, about which there have also been many complaints. (The notary public department received 904 letters, and the defense attorney department 845.) Inspections of complaint investigations must be improved, and the state of affairs there must be analyzed more thoroughly. Regular supervision must be established to ensure strict adherence to established rules of receiving the public. The public should be informed of the contents of the Ukase of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on Rules for Considering Citizens' Proposals, Reports and Complaints, dated March 4, 1980: the same occasions should

be used to interpret for the public, as well as for public officials, the Ukase of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on anonymous denunciations, dated February 2, 1988.

All this should help achieve more active and effective perestroika in justice organizations and the courts, and fuller implementation of the principles of glasnost, democratization and justice.

Copyright: Izdatelstvo "Yuridicheskaya literatura", zhurnal "Sovetskaya yustitsiya", 1988.

12892

### Archivist Urges Legal Regulation of State Documents

18000404 Moscow *IZVESTIYA* in Russian  
2 Jun 88 p 4

[Interview with Aleksandr Ivanovich Chugunov, director of the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Documentation and Archives, by R. Armelev, *IZVESTIYA* correspondent: "Without Archives There Is No History"; date and place not given]

[Text] Seventy years ago, on 1 June 1918, the Council of People's Commissars approved a decree entitled "On the Reorganization and Centralization of Archives in RSFSR." The decree was signed by V.I. Lenin.

A.I. Chugunov, director of All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Documentation and Archives, spoke with *IZVESTIYA*'s correspondent about the state of archives today and about their problems.

[Question] Aleksandr Ivanovich, this event 70 years ago, adoption of the decree on archives, can be instructive even today?

[Answer] No question about it. Even if it were not for the anniversary, for the work alone it is worth examining and remembering Lenin's attitude toward the archives, which in recent decades have been viewed as something of third-rate importance, sin that it is. I will quote lines from one of Lenin's telegrams: "...personal responsibility is taken for complete preservation of mines, equipment, and archives." Do you sense the level of importance given to "scraps of paper" beneath the contempt of many people? Or take this from an order issued in December 1917: "Special measures must be taken to prevent destruction of papers...." Lenin looked on the loss of archives as "equivalent to a severe historical misfortune." The decree dated 1 June 1918 became the world's first piece of legislation of that kind. Its 12 points briefly and clearly express Lenin's ideas about the nature of socialist restructuring of archives and their management.

[Question] I have heard that the personnel of archives have talked about reorganizing your system. Is that so?

[Answer] Yes, there is serious discussion of the question of transferring the entire state archives service to the Ministry of Justice. At present, as is well-known, the Chief Archives Administration is attached to the USSR Council of Ministers.

[Question] I sense in your voice a note of dissatisfaction and regret. Does it matter so much to whom you are subordinate? Is it not more important that the work itself not suffer...

[Answer] That is in fact the point, we have been grieved about the work from the outset.... How has the situation developed over the last 70 years? In the beginning they decided that the archives service must be attached to the People's Commissariat of Education, where it would have the status of a separate unit. They operated that way for a few years and saw that the archives were never a concern among the problems of the People's Commissariat of Education, they were given a backseat. Then in 1922 the Main Administration of Archives was removed from the People's Commissariat of Education and transferred to the All-Russian Central Executive Committee. Nor was this any accident: the archives where all the invariable experience has been concentrated, which contain the entire retrospective survey of government affairs and public opinion, must not be subordinate to any specific department; they must have a certain independence. But in 1938 archive institutions were again transferred to a people's commissariat, this time the USSR People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs. And what happened? Use of archive documents for national economic and scientific research purposes was immediately restricted, there was a sharp reduction in the publication of historical materials and the scholarly reference material related to archive holdings. The mistake was corrected only in 1960, when the Main Archives Administration was placed under jurisdiction of the supreme executive body of government—the USSR Council of Ministers.

[Question] The transfer was exactly that, but judging by the complaints of researchers, they forgot to remove the restriction to access to the archives....

[Answer] That is just the trouble, that restructuring in archives, I am profoundly convinced, must consist not of yet another transfer from subordination to the Council of Ministers to a department—from the standpoint of historical experience this would undoubtedly be a step backward—but of changing the style and methods, that is, the quality of the work of the main administration, of our entire service. I also feel that the community needs to be involved in management of the archives.

[Question] It would be interesting to hear how you conceive that.

[Answer] A situation has now come about in which the role of the Main Archives Administration has proven to be oversized. Various proposals reach its departments

from below, and however prompt, unanimous, and crucial they may be, the department is give the same answer: We will think about it, they say, we will take a look at it. And they themselves think that since they are the top official level, it is up to them to decide everything: everything will be as they decide. Quite often they act contrary to opinions from below. The wave of public initiative, that is, breaks up on the magnificent rocks of the main administration. In my opinion, the work would be different if a majority in the collegium were not senior officials from the government, but representatives of the public, all of those—historians, researchers, administrative specialists [upravlyentsy], economists, and writers—who in their work are involved with the archives. Then such a body would become democratic and would not be timid about defending up-to-date points of view and acting on them.

We might even try this kind of alternative: let part of the senior officials of the Main Archives Administration be elected by practicing archivists and by that same archive-related community we mentioned above. With the single objective that the documents, which now have been stored for decades without moving, must do their job.

[Question] It seems to me that up-to-date electronic computer equipment could help more than anything else in getting documents into circulation.

[Answer] A new era in our field is coming with the arrival of electronics in the archives and in documentation. We have been working on this, although, alas, more slowly than we would like. In the state archives alone we have 600,000 repositories and about 350 million units being stored—that is a great many. We have begun to key in the annotation of the holdings, we have been creating a data bank.... The computer "loves" an extremely high degree of organization, discipline, and that's the difficulty now. We have begun to study documentation in various institutions—those of the government, of soviets, in the economy—and have ascertained that their computers do not understand one another, even though they may be in the same class. Which means that it will take quite a bit of time to standardize their language and teach them to understand. It takes time for all branches and sectors (including the archives) to be interconnected by a unified information system so that they might obtain the necessary data not by mail, not by messenger, after days or weeks, but in the very second after the request is made. This is a most acute problem!

[Question] As far as I understand this as a layman, one first needs a unified system of documents—current, reporting, and so on, understandable both to the human and to the computer. And we are fighting an ocean of paper of all kinds, generally without much success.

[Answer] Our collective development has been gathering dust on the road to the Council of Ministers for 3 years now. This is its title: Uniform State System of Documentary Support of Management (YeGSDOU). What is it?

These are uniform coded forms of the necessary documents—the order, the decree, the decision, the command, the document, the business letter, and so on; it contains uniform principles and methods for processing and presenting documents both under traditional conditions and also using computers. Provision is made so that introduction of this system would reduce the number of documents to between one-fifth and one-tenth of what it has been. On the basis of the YeGSDOU we have developed several standard subsystems; for example, documentation of the proceedings of sessions of local soviets and their ipsovkoms, supporting the documentation management of the ministry (department) at the union level. On the basis of this development it is possible to solve all questions of documentation of management activity in a competent way—which we have had a terrible lack of!—including the optimum and effective application of electronic computers.

[Question] But the archives? Has their place in this system been taken into account?

[Answer] Of course. This is a unified system which does not hamper at all the practical activity of the manager, and makes it possible for the archivist to know what kind of information is contained in which document even in the stage of its origination and to have the right orientation when the document reaches the archives, which also have electronic equipment.

[Question] Perhaps this development is for us like an unexpected and unwanted pregnancy? Why is it gathering dust?

[Answer] I do not know. A delegation of American archivists recently made a visit to our archives service. Their sincere envy was aroused by our unified state system of archives—the one that was established by Lenin's decree. And if they had learned about the YeGSDOU, they would have been fired up, they would have decided to introduce it at home in spite of the strictly departmental nature of their own archives. But we have already received 12,000 requests from the local level—everyone wants to operate under this system. But we cannot recommend it—it has not been approved....

[Question] I have long been interested in questions like this: What in general do the archives permit, and what is prohibited? After how many years can the various holdings be opened for general use? How and when are documents destroyed after they have lived out their life? Can any high official, for instance, order a document that bothers him for some reason to be taken out of storage?

[Answer] Those are complicated questions. And this is why. So far we have not had a specific law stipulating all of these and other provisions concerning operation of the state archives. And that is why much depends on ad hoc orders, some old instructions, and directions that were simply subjective. Such a law is very necessary; it would

even provide the legal basis for opening repositories for general use and would enumerate those documents which have to be stored in perpetuity, those which are to be destroyed after a certain time, but in any case there would be a threat of serious accountability preventing anyone, whoever it might be, from subjective intervention in the life of the archives. I will say that the draft of a Law on the USSR State Archives has been prepared but it has not undergone broad discussion and slipped off the track somewhere. I feel it is time to go back to it.

[Question] The question, we might say, for the 21st century, for future scientists, is what should be selected for storage today, what principles should be followed, and how much should be stored?

[Answer] Another question, as they say, to go into the hopper. There are countries, Finland, for example, which store a large portion of documents. We on the other hand select 2-4 percent. There is a disastrous shortage of storage facilities for archives, their construction is poor and slow. The documents to be stored are selected by expert commissions of enterprises and institutions. Unfortunately, this again is a process that is almost closed to the public, to historians, errors are quite often made because of a kind of group subjectivism; after all, expert commissions are not chosen by any means to take into account public opinion; random people are usually appointed to them.

As for making up the archives, we lack vigor, promptness, and flexibility. Today, in the context of restructuring, that is, in revolutionary times, we should be selecting not 2-4 percent of the documents for storage, but say half. And especially those which clearly characterize the processes taking place in society and in the economy. It is no accident that Lenin, when he began the revolution, called for every note to be collected and stored. Without archives, alas, there is no history, without archives there remain only legends and anecdotes.

[Question] A word or two, Aleksandr Ivanovich, about the publishing activity of the archives....

[Answer] It is far from what we would wish it to be. Our printing plant is old and has a small capacity. And there evidently has been no enterprise. Why, for example, not publish collections that would further restructuring, choosing documents accurately and comprehensively, without abridgment, on a particular crucial problem. For example, why was the economic reform in the sixties unsuccessful? How did the "project of the century"—reversing the flow of the northern rivers—fantastic in its cost and ecological stupidity—become possible? The documents on the period of collectivization, the NEP, and so on.... How much benefit might come, say, from a large-circulation monthly or even an annual from our archives....

[Question] The archivist represents an ancient occupation still referred to by its ancient name of archivarius. It seems that he receives 90 rubles per month. Where do you find qualified people devoted to their work who are so indifferent to financial gain?

[Answer] Personnel are a problem. That ancient word "archivarius" frightens young people. The pay rates are miserly, but the work load and responsibility have been increasing. The question has been repeatedly raised of replacing the "archivarius" with something up-to-date and of a deserved rise of salaries. Otherwise, personnel will not be permanent, there will be turnover and low qualifications, which has a truly pernicious effect on the work.

We hope that the wind of change, democracy, and glasnost will blow through open doors even into our archives. They are something that belong to the entire nation independently of any narrow department, and they should be doing active service for restructuring.

07045

#### MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA Views 'Democratic Union'

18000383a Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 14 May 88 p 2

[Article by Yu. Shabanov: "Spicy Sauce for 'Democracy'"]

[Text] I became acquainted with Valeriya Novodvorskaya on the evening of 7 May near the Krasnopresnensk metro station as the representatives of unofficial associations from Moscow and elsewhere gathered to hold a meeting. It was the same Novodvorskaya who had been a leader of the seminar "Democracy and Humanism," who was well known for her extremely radical—more accurately, extremist—views, and who for the past four months had managed to take part in several demonstrations.

On that evening in May she was distributing with a special air of solemnity a neatly block-lettered handbill to the "unofficial" representatives which bore the title "Democratic Union."

What sort of a union is this and what are its objectives? On the day following the initial meeting of the "conference," the Voice of America radio station openly and unequivocally made this announcement: "The policy of political reform instituted by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee has led to an unprecedented attempt to form an opposition party inside the Soviet Union....A document describing the founding of the Democratic Union defines the goals of the group as providing political opposition to the existing system." For that matter, the organizers of the "DU" did not hide

their credo; they expressed it even more sharply as a struggle on their part—and as teaching the people to engage in this struggle—to replace the present regime.

Let us accompany the delegates, who as a precaution concealed their home-made badges under their coats and jackets as they walked to Rochdelskaya Street, where the first session of the "conference" was scheduled to begin at House No. 11/5. Common Room No. 4, the scheduled site, turned out to be closed for repairs. In anticipation of such an occurrence, an alternative site had been designated: Apartment No. 171 in the same building, occupied by a couple named Bogachev. There more than a hundred delegates turned up, consisting of Moscovites and their guests from such cities as Leningrad, Kiev, Tomsk, Kaluga, and Krasnodar.

Their arrival, it should be pointed out, proved to be utterly unexpected for the apartment-dwellers, who had offered to be of assistance only in providing a common room. The newcomers did not consider their objections; they themselves started acting like proprietors, arbitrarily shutting doors so that passers-by could not enter, and cutting off the telephone and doorbell.

Aleksandr Lukashev, a member of the organizing committee, delivered a report. He began on a shrill note: "This is a very special day in the history of the country and its democratic movement...about which our ideological forebears have dreamed throughout 70 years of domination by a repressive regime and the suppression of every kind of freedom of thought." The thought occurred to me: Are not these the very same people who work for the western radio stations and, forgetful of their homeland, as they earn the bread of strangers, slander their country with lightweight loyalty? It is no accident that, among the "ideological dreamers" referred to by members of the "DU", no mention was made of the names, cleared of slander, of Bukharin, Rykov, Vernadskiy, Vavilov, or other genuine revolutionaries and innovators. These are people who stood up for members of the opposition, as did the first head of the Soviet Government, for that matter, and all who fought for true socialism on the other side of the barricades.

Just listen to the pretentious declaration issued by the editorial board of the so-called independent journal POYEDINOK in support of the political platform of "DU" participating organizations "Perestroika 88," the Free International Professional Association of Workers, and the seminar "Democracy and Humanism": "The editorial board is united in its conviction that Russia 70 years ago could have and should have chosen a different path for its development." That is interesting. What sort of a path? That of the bourgeois democracies. It was for this reason that lamentations were heard among the "DU" members about the "untimely death" of the February Revolution. And Great October, according to

their interpretation, came about because of the unlawful overthrow of the government by the usurping Bolsheviks, the recollection of which made them visibly seethe with resentment.

This is the fundamental truth about the "DU" as it dreams sweet dreams of restoring capitalism under the code name democratic parliamentarianism in emulation of the civilized "free world."

It was not by chance that Novodvorskaya dropped this remark: "A genuine political power has been created in the country that repudiates the illusory superiority of the socialist regime, oriented to a whole series of criteria in the West—and certain members of the opposition to absolutely everything."

Now, as for genuine power, this is a gross exaggeration and a vain attempt to display with grating pretension wishful thinking in place of reality. Is this not the reason that so much attention is given to ostentatious forms of attribution—to badges, mandates, and declarations? To such a plethora of pronouncements? We are concerned with a mere handful of persons who thirst for glory as "victims of a totalitarian society," as they describe themselves. In addition, there are a few dozen hangers-on for reasons of inadequate thought, waywardness, or an urge to experience vivid sensations, who—as a member of the Leninist Social-Demographic Union, Roman Astakhov, acknowledged—are without a cause. However, we cannot ignore them or fail to notice the "DU" and keep silent about it today; for its main ideas are profoundly alien to our people and to the spirit of socialism. They must be shown up in the clear light of glasnost and debunked. And all the more so for the reason expressed by Nina Nereutskaya, representing the Marxist-Leninist platform of the group Deystviye [Action], that "politically immature fellows, deceived by bold democratic pronouncements, may get stuck in this stinking swamp."

We have been through all this before in our history: bright victories and bitter defeats; surprising discoveries and incorrectable errors; revolutionary outcries by the masses and long years of being deaf and dumb; violations of socialist law, and crimes against the regime itself. But this has been among ourselves. Thus it is possible to anathematize the entire path that has been taken, to pile in a single heap heroes and criminals alike, and to sigh nostalgically, "What if...." But history cannot be measured hypothetically. It is necessary to think how to straighten out what is crooked, how to restore the traditions of Lenin, democracy, and glasnost.

The entire matter, it turns out, is attributable to a point of view that foreshortens the vision. But at times it is not easy to discern this. What did Aleksandr Mashevskiy, an electrician from the city of Volzhskiy, and his friend, Oleg Sokolov, a student in a vuz for the humanities, bring to the "conference"? Democratic principles for the "DU" party program. Let us be objective. Much that was

in it is in the spirit of the restructuring. Pluralism of ideas and opinions. Today this is simply essential for the society, so that we can air the stale stench of stagnation and rid ourselves of the bureaucratic and authoritarian style of leadership. But what "DU" proposes is prefixed by "anti"—anti-communism and anti-sovietism. This is not pluralism. We stand for soviet pluralism.

As informal movements gathering momentum at this time, hundreds of associations and groups afford an example of how—not in words but in actions—to oppose the forces of inertia and bureaucracy, to defend democracy and glasnost, to build and to create. They are waging battles to preserve the ecology and historical antiquities, and to restore spiritual values. Such efforts are rightly worthy of respect.

But when other groups of the kind created by the "DU," under the banner of democracy and glasnost, which we have suffered to attain, propose to us that we abolish socialism and the entire 70 years of our history, when they try to impose on us alien ideas, excuse me, but that is another matter altogether. Such a group is our ideological adversary. And however ludicrous its pretensions to a prophetic role, we cannot retreat from a dialogue with it. One that is frank and uncompromising. I am convinced that there would have been far fewer advocates of "democratic union" at the "conference" if those invited to attend had known in advance that, under the guise of party pluralism, the organizers had in mind the existence of a regimented, monarchial, even fascist party; that they looked upon the USSR as an "evil empire"—a term disowned by even the most vehement anti-communists; that they considered the officers and servicemen in Afghanistan to be worse than Hitler's hangmen, and the Russian people as a whole to be oppressors and slave-masters of all the nationalities in the union republics.

Characteristically, the more deeply the oppositionists disclosed the body of their so-called democratic principles with its seamy underside of anti-communism, the more those present turned away from them. On the very first day, after detecting the hypocritical tone in the policy of Novodvorskaya, Debryanskaya, Kuzin, Lukashev, and other leaders of the future party, even its active proponents took a negative attitude. Here is what Andrey Gryaznov, a member of a Eurocommunist splinter group, had to say:

"In principle we are not in agreement with the premise that socialism does not have the right to existence. Our society is capable of becoming fully democratic. We repudiate, too, pressure tactics on the government through demonstrations, strikes, and the like, as advocated by the radical wing of the party."

This unexpected rejection aroused the dismay of the "DU" leadership. ("Millions of the living and the dead are marching behind us," Novodvorskaya had pronounced grandly as the meeting got under way.) It also

aroused an open display of vindictiveness. The spokesmen for "broad democracy" simply would not allow others to lodge their objections, and at this point began accusing them of creating provocations and pinning labels on them, alleging that they had been recruited by the KGB.

"We cannot allow discussion on our platform—it has already been adopted."

This is the kind of democracy, it turns out, to be found in the bill submitted by Saltykov-Shchedrin's town governor: "Regarding Freedom From Constraint for the Town Governor in Carrying Out the Laws." While repudiating ideological monopolies, "DU" introduces one of its own—and let no one dare stand in its way.

"Give them power and they will create the same sort of totalitarian state..."

In sum, there was not a normal discussion in the entire three days of the "conference." They came by invitation, but it was of a peculiar kind: First, enroll in the party, and afterwards discuss it.

The "DU" leaders did not sidestep pointed questions asked by correspondents of the western information media. But understandably the questions had a specific orientation. The leaders willingly posed before the television cameras, and shouted that the police would not let them through and were using force. Incidentally, the police on the first day of the "conference" appeared at the house where the Bogachevs live, but as the western journalists themselves noted, there was no use of force. In the interest of objectivity, let me add that the policemen, after they found out where the proprietors were located, tried to enter the apartment. They rang the bell, and knocked at the door, but that was all.

"After listening to them, I understood there was nothing there but vanity and play-acting," said Aleksandr Mashevskiy. "They have no spirit of their own. They are just whistling a tune happily taught them by our western well-wishers. Their activities are a blow in the back to all unofficial democratic organizations."

Do you see how all this came about? They are whistling a tune they have picked up. Yet how can the Voice of America send fear into us from across the ocean? By creating chaos. The restructuring can turn into chaos if we do not put a halt to it in time, bearing in mind, of course, the orders of the CIA (as reported in the press) to consolidate the forces of opposition. It is in this way that our internal adversaries pose a threat to us, oblivious of the fact that those of an altogether different persuasion have been silently swarming in the cellars throughout the period of stagnation, unseen and unheard. Yet now they have come to light. Like scum. Shadows of yesterday.

But more visible than shadows, so that they are easier to contend with, being clearly illuminated—both our ideological adversaries from the "DU" and those for whose mill they serve as the grist.

12889

**'Pamyat' Members Speak Out on Their Organization, Its Aims**  
18000383b Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 19 May 88 p 3

[Roundtable discussion with members of the Pamyat Society conducted by T. Sergeyeva: "Memory Has Its Own Laws"]

[Text] Following the publication in our newspaper of the commentary "Pamyat: What Man Does To Man," the telephone has not stopped ringing at the editorial office. People have been asking what this patriotic movement that was mentioned is, and what is its relationship to that "Pamyat" that has been referred to frequently in the journals of nationalist and extremist organizations. Who can respond to these questions better than activists in the movement themselves?

The following persons participated in a discussion held in our editorial office: T. A. Ponomareva, member of the USSR Writers Union; G. I. Litvinova, doctor of juridical sciences; I. S. Sychev, member of the USSR Writers Union; G. I. Frygin, engineer; Professor S. I. Zhdanov, doctor of chemical sciences; Docent A. S. Vasilenko, candidate of philosophical sciences; and A. K. Svetozarskiy, teacher of Russian language and literature.

We tried not to pass over controversial or unresolved issues and to include in our discussion insofar as possible other opinions drawn from correspondence, conversations by telephone, or persons interviewed.

[Correspondent] Questions of historical and national memory, and forgetfulness of it, are extremely topical today, and at times painful. Particularly, the construction put on them in Moscow, which is the center of the multinational soviet state and in which, together with Russians, 1.5 million people of other nationalities are living.

One cannot but note that a battle is being waged even around our understanding of the word "pamyat" itself. Some persons quietly speak of the "unseemliness" of referring to a book by V. I. Chivilikhin—a book which for many began the process of national self-awareness.

[G. I. Frygin] It all began with the Vityazi Society of Genadii Salnikov. But that soon broke up. I am one of those who originated the Pamyat movement, which arose at the end of the 1970's. I arranged the first evenings and Sunday meetings for the restoration of historical and cultural monuments. One of our first practical projects was putting in order the grave site of

the historian Tatishchev. We also held a meeting there, inspected the property, and in short combined into one activity creative work and the acquiring of knowledge. To the evening meetings, dedicated to centuries of Russian history, we would invite specialists, and it was difficult to make any kind of claims to us. The specialists would appear when problems began to be discussed at a vulgar level of crude philosophizing, and this is one of the lessons we learned from this: Questions must be posed in a correct scientific manner—they must be factually precise.

The name Pamyat for our movement was on the lips of many of us, including myself, which is understandable. It is no accident that the Russian Ivan, being unaware of his heritage, should prove to be a human type that the consciousness of people cannot grasp or comprehend, is it? And is not this form of forgetfulness, as depicted by the Kirghiz writer Aytmatov, clear to us?

Let us open two Russian-language dictionaries, Ozhegov's and the one by [Vladimir] Dal, and compare the meanings given for the word "pamyat." We can see how much more deeply the meaning goes in the old dictionary than in the current one. In Dal it is not only the capacity to remember and not to forget the past but a disposition of the soul to preserve and maintain an awareness of days gone by; an intelligent, scientifically sound understanding of what is known; and the permanent assimilation of spiritual and moral principles. That is the kind of comprehension that allows us to speak of the Pamyat movement as an intellectual and spiritual movement. It is certainly no coincidence that Dal noted down this meaning for memory in action; it is this concept that we arm ourselves with, not only to preserve the heritage of the past but even to increase it.

[A. S. Vasilenko] In my view our movement ought to render assistance to the state with respect to forming in the country new ways of thinking and new habits of discussion. In this connection it is incumbent on us to overcome many of the stereotypes and ways of thinking that became ingrained in the public consciousness during the preceding period. For example, the habit of pinning labels on opponents with the intention of discrediting them ideologically or morally. The Pamyat movement arose among scholars, engineers, workers, students, and the creative intelligentsia, concerned with fate of the cultural heritage of the Russian people. Seeing that the restoration of monuments and the safeguarding of traditions cannot be left in the hands of the state, these people, at considerable sacrifice, began to make noble efforts along independent lines.

But people with extremist views began to show up in the movement. It would seem fitting to subject the extremists to criticism and to help the rest continue needed efforts to restore public monuments. But no, the label of extremism was applied to the movement as a whole, and consequently constructive cooperation of the movement with the state was made more difficult.

[Correspondent] I think that a large share of the blame for this lies with the participants in the movement, who waited too long and patiently for some one to purge their ranks for them and weed out impostors who in 1985 were taking refuge behind the name.

Nevertheless, it must be acknowledged that in many respects the passiveness displayed by the independent associations was nurtured by a policy of prohibition towards them. G. I. Frygin, as well as other witnesses, has described how people broke through the cordons when they came to honor the memory of their ancestors, who six centuries earlier had been defeated on the field of Kulikovo. G. B. Myasnikov, deputy chairman of the Soviet Cultural Fund, declared at one of his press conferences that we are now reaping a bitter harvest, which need not have occurred if we had not commemorated the 660-year-old Battle of Kulikovo at the level of the Russians versus the Tula Tatars.

[A. K. Svetozarskiy] I have not heard a single innovative teacher, alas, say how important it is to instill in children a sense of kinship with their own people and a sense of remembered history. And this must be done in the literal sense of continuing life. A four-year-old was asked her mother's name. "Mama Zoya." And the family name? The child was silent. And what is the name of your grandfather? the child was asked. "Grandpa." The temporal connection is severed by the third generation, while it is still living. There are not many parents who are capable of talking with their children about the national history and the national consciousness.

From the responses to a questionnaire by children in the ninth grade in Moscow, we learn that Minin and Pozharskiy constructed a cathedral on Red Square; that Pushkin was born in Mikhaylovsk and Lermontov in the Caucasus; and that Peresvet and Oslabyalya, according to one version, fought with one another before the start of the Battle of Kulikovo, and according to another took part in the campaign of Prince Igor.

The pictures of the life of the people during the prerevolutionary period, as depicted in the schoolbooks, can drive one to despair. Entirely too little is said of the moral and spiritual riches of the people and of the joyfully affirmative world view which helped them to withstand the hard times.

The textbooks also have a good deal to say about the "contradictions" and foibles of the geniuses of Russian literature. But they have extremely little to say about why it is that they were nevertheless great representatives of the people; what they did for the glory of the their native land; and why they shined, and continue to shine, before the entire world. Not to mention the disappearance of classic writers and certain of their works from the school curriculum. Leskov, who created an entire gallery of positive characters, continues to be beyond the limitations that have been set.

Generally, without the right training in school and especially in the family (it is important that family history be taught by people in the family), any kind of monument is going to remain for children simply a heap of stones assembled by strangers, as if they came from another planet. It is very difficult to teach children to see in architectural ruins traces of former beauty or anything remarkable, and it is not easy to motivate them to work in restoring historical and cultural sites.

[T. A. Ponomareva] Although Aleksandr Konstantinovich prefaced his remarks by saying that they were no more than personal observations, I think they contain a bitter truth. And since I should like to discuss the aims and tasks of this movement, I would call your attention to the fact, first of all, that they are openly accessible for the new generation. The Moscow organization of the patriotic movement Pamyat has established as its mission the cultural enlightenment of the people. We will be concerning ourselves from now on with the problem of youthful trends and with inculcating in youth a respect for tradition and the experience of preceding generations. In addressing the problem of the ecology of nature, we act to protect the boundaries of the green land, which serves as a faithful friend. It is impossible to separate the ecology of nature from the ecology of culture. By participating in the activities of the organs of public education, institutes of culture, higher educational institutions, creative unions, and social organizations, we will be attempting everywhere to purify the present state of enlightenment. And we consider the knowledge of regional lore, history, and economy to be our primary task. Russia is one of the first countries in the world where the study of local lore and history has been placed on a scientific basis. Yet this subject disappeared from the school curriculum after regional historians met for the last time in 1928. This nearsightedness was, in effect, first of all, a blow to patriotism.

[G. I. Litvinova] It is absolutely necessary to teach in the schools of Moscow the great riches of the history of our native land. Unless we do so, it is perfectly clear to me, we will not raise our people to be citizens. I finished school in Smolensk. Our history teacher there, Tsilya Abramovna Aronova, would set aside 10 minutes of the lesson to give us an analysis of the historical events we were studying—for example, events in Europe—as compared with contemporaneous events in Smolensk. The textbooks of the time were not ideal. Yet I can recount until this very day the entire history of Smolensk. Of course, the personality of the teacher is of enormous significance.

[Correspondent] I should like to name a specific site where the Moscow participants in the movement could apply their efforts. A recent session of the Proletarskiy Rayon Soviet of People's Deputies dealt with the question of creating a pedestrian zone in a place designated as a cultural and historical area on Vostochnaya Street. Persons active in the movement could help to make the pedestrian zone, which is located in a working area of

Moscow, a center of original national culture, uniting into a single display monuments of antiquity, notable sightseeing points of the Soviet period, and newly erected sites. The residents of the rayon extend an invitation to you to participate in this remarkable undertaking.

[T. A. Ponomareva] We accept the invitation with pleasure.

[Correspondent] Who can become participants in the movement? Certain readers and callers to the editorial office are very apprehensive of a nationalistic trend in the movement—a tilt towards great power chauvinism.

[S. I. Zhdanov] Basically, the movement is developing in Russia, among the Russians. But it is in no way closed to representatives of other peoples. Are the Russians trying to achieve a special position for themselves? No. I think that the Russian nation has borne a number of losses, but it has always been at the frontiers of history. We have lost a good deal, too, from the senseless destruction of monuments. It is necessary to restore what has been lost with patience and persistence.

We are all deeply upset about what has been going on among the Crimean Tartars, in Nagorno-Kabarakh, in the Baltic and in Kazakhstan. As a Russian I have the greatest sympathy with trying to resolve the problems of any nationality. They are, after all, my brothers.

[T. A. Ponomareva] Any citizen of the Soviet Union we consider eligible to become a participant in the Pamyat movement if he shares our convictions that it is only through the organized efforts of all patriots, and the active and unremitting efforts of each one, that Soviet power can be strengthened and our lives be made better.

[Correspondent] You call the Pamyat movement patriotic, as if singling this word out for emphasis. Lev Tolstoy wrote about the hidden warmth of patriotism in Russians, pointing out that their feeling of love for their motherland burned most intensely in times of greatest trials. Is it not strange today for a Russian to beat his chest while affirming his love for his country? Reticent in terms of expression, it is demonstrated in action.

[A. K. Svetozarskiy] The idea of the quiet, hidden warmth of patriotism has consoled us for too long. Without elaborating on this thesis, I will speak only of the destructive influence of mass culture, of rock culture, which in my judgment is without roots in our civilization.

[G. I. Antinova] It is an accepted practice among us to speak of old-fashioned patriotism, "kvass" patriotism, but speak softly about our present-day feelings. But the time has come to speak out about many things openly and loudly. Nowadays in the schools of the Russian Federation children are learning less than they did in 1940, according to information that is available. In the

Smolensk area, in the heart of Russia, last year they wrote off 147 villages. Hence the alarm for the future and the demand for democratization, and hence the Pamyat movement is summoned to action. And this poses no threat of any kind from great-power chauvinism. We are concerned with *de facto* equality of all peoples and nations and with creating conditions for demonstrating this equality in action.

All of these processes require deep study, including even such an aspect as powerful penetration into every area of mass culture. Some television programs, carried in all-Union broadcasts, completely fail to take into consideration centuries-old traditions or the national psychology of peoples who have settled in our country. These programs touch upon national sentiments and they may even offend people and elicit an unhealthy frame of mind. How is one to explain that these programs are a product not of Russian culture but of mass culture? Even the language used, of course, is Russian.

[Correspondent] The issue has already been raised in the press: Should each nationality create its own Pamyat? And what if their principles come into conflict? Our times give rise to complex questions. But life itself provides answers to them. Quite recently an association was formed in Moscow to honor Ukrainian culture. It was named "Slavutich" (an ancient name for the Dnepr River). Ukrainians living in Moscow formed the nucleus of the organization, joined by Russians, Jews, Armenians, and others who love the Ukrainian language and culture.

A Moscow Society of Armenian Culture has just been formed with the symbolic name of "Baryev dzez" ("wishing you well").

A resident of Moscow, Rafkat Galimov, who is a veteran of the war and of labor, writes: "To hold an evening meeting with persons who write in the Tatar language, it is necessary to run around half the city in order to find a place for it by begging or paying money to hire it."

I think the Slavutich Association provides an example of how to join in playing a more active part in resolving problems in the lives of the various nationalities in Moscow and in the development of their culture.

Many issues have arisen recently associated with the unsatisfactory state of cultures native to people of different nationalities who are now living in Moscow. Moreover, certain persons are inclined to see in this a phenomenon signaling the rise of chauvinism and pressure by Russians on other peoples. What is your reaction?

[I. S. Sychev] Negative. I feel the same way about the contention that proper conditions are not being developed for the cultures of other nationalities as I do about laying the blame for it on the Russians. I think it would be hard to find a Russian who would reply that he

objected to Tatars, Ukrainians, Armenians, Uzbeks or Jews studying their own language or propagandizing the culture of their people. That they should not become culturally isolated, and be allowed by Muscovites to form nationalist quarters, is another matter.

[Correspondent] This is what S. Aleksandrov writes to the editors: "I wholeheartedly endorse the proposal made by MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA about the necessity of creating an inter-school facility for language study. It would be a Palace of Friendship of Peoples with folklore groups, theaters, museums, and libraries. Here, permanent representations from the union republics, attached to the USSR Council of Ministers, would be of great help. Moreover, the time has come to transform the Exhibitions of the Achievements of the National Economy so that they reach the point where they can function as permanent centers of the cultures of all the nations and nationalities of our country. As I recall, before the war the All-Union exhibition handled these functions magnificently."

Our conversation leads to the conclusion that Pamyat should be a multi-national and international movement. I will compare it to a tree the branches of which represent sections dealing with problems of different but equal cultures, mutually enriching one another without becoming self-isolated. According to Dostoyevskiy, Russian culture has always been characterized by its openness in relation to other cultures and its universal humanity. This should not be forgotten.

[I. S. Sychev] I am aware that there is talk in connection with the Pamyat movement that, purportedly, it is looking for enemies within the organization who are people of non-Russian nationality, so that all mistakes and failures may be blamed on them. The Pamyat movement will not pass away because of acceptance by national and international fascists. The grassroots Pamyat movement must not be confused with the so-called "Pamyat" association. They are entirely different things.

We have enemies, and so has the restructuring process. And we shall struggle with them, exploiting all the power of public influence. These enemies are, first of all, bureaucratism and public display that is purely for show, as when monuments are erected along the paths of the tourist traffic where they may be seen from the windows of buses.

History, for us, is a mighty means of education. From our forebears we are learning to take action in increasing what is left to us of our cultural and historical heritage for the welfare of our native land.

### Jurists Discuss Legal Means To Fight Rising Moonshine Production

18000403 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA ZAKONNOST in Russian No 4, Apr 88 (signed to press 6 Apr 88) pp 29-31

[Article by R. Brize, member of the USSR Supreme Court, and V. Gordeyev, deputy head of the USSR Supreme Court Department for the Generalization of Judicial Practice: "Correctly Apply Property Confiscation in Cases of Illegal Alcohol Production"]

[Excerpts] As experience shows, there has been a recent weakening of the struggle against drunkenness; the sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages has increased, and this is the reason for an increase in crimes committed as a result of drunkenness. In the first half of 1987 every third crime committed throughout the country was committed in a state of intoxication, and in certain regions—the Latvian SSR; the Estonian SSR; the Arkhangelsk, Vologda and Ivanovo oblasts; and the Udmurt ASSR, for example—this indicator was significantly higher.

At the present time illegal alcohol production is becoming an especially serious obstacle in the effort to overcome drunkenness and alcoholism. The implementation of measures aimed at increasing the struggle against drunkenness and alcoholism, including price increases for wine and spirits and the restrictions introduced on their sale, have resulted in the extensive spread of home distillation of alcohol; this is occurring in cities as well as rural areas.

According to data from the USSR MVD, administrative and criminal proceedings for acts associated with illegal alcohol production were instituted against five times more offenders in the first nine months of 1987 than in 1985; in the last two years more than a million devices for the manufacture of illegal alcohol were seized from the public, and 4 million liters of illegal alcohol were destroyed.

In 1986 the number of those convicted for the manufacture of home-distilled vodka and other domestically-produced spirits increased 2.5-fold in comparison with 1985 and more than 6-fold in comparison with 1984. The increase in convictions for this crime continued in the first half of 1987 as well.

There has also been a noticeable increase in the proportion of persons convicted of illegal alcohol production. It has now become one of the most widespread crimes. The RSFSR accounts for most of the illegal alcohol production cases (about 70 percent of those convicted of this crime); moreover, it has become particularly widespread in the industrial centers of the Urals and Siberia (Sverdlovsk, Chelyabinsk, Perm, Krasnoyarsk, Irkutsk) and in the Sakhalin and Kamchatka oblasts. A disturbing situation has also developed in the Ukraine, in Belorussia, Kazakhstan and Lithuania.

Home distillation of alcohol has ceased to be a typically "rural" crime. Currently domestic alcohol production is penetrating cities and towns with increasing frequency, and various strata of the population are manufacturing and consuming it: up to 45 percent of all home distillers live in cities, and 54 percent of those convicted under Article 158 of the RSFSR Criminal Code and the corresponding articles in the criminal codes of the other union republics are blue- and white-collar workers.

The manufacture and sale of home-distilled alcohol have begun to seriously complicate the situation in many cities, housing projects and dormitories. Recently something like alcohol "dens," where home distillers and speculators deal in alcohol, have sprung up and begun to spread. All this significantly complicates the struggle against drunkenness and alcoholism.

In addition, home alcohol production wastes a large quantity of valuable food products, especially sugar. It is no accident that the sale of sugar has grown sharply of late; it has increased by 1.5 million tons in the last two years alone.

According to data published in the press, nationwide sugar sales increased 25 percent in October 1987 alone. In individual regions the numbers are even greater: the increase was 70 percent in Estonia and 57 percent in Armenia. In certain Moscow stores daily sugar sales have increased 2-3-fold.

The number of sugar thefts at enterprises, warehouses and in retail trade has also increased. In the last two years sugar thefts have provided the basis for a total of 1,600 criminal cases. During the same period the number of yeast thefts increased 2-fold.

Of late there has arisen with increasing frequency the question of whether or not the courts are making full use of the criminal law to eradicate home alcohol production. In particular, it was noted that the courts rarely specify as additional punishment the confiscation of property, even when people who are guilty of manufacturing and storing home-produced alcohol for the purpose of selling it or are guilty of selling it commit these crimes to extract non-labor incomes and personal enrichment.

Because it attaches great significance to the correct application of property confiscation in cases of home alcohol production, the USSR Supreme Court summarized judicial practices in cases of this category, using data from court statistics for 1985-1987.

In general the people convicted under Article 158 of the RSFSR Criminal Code and the corresponding articles in the criminal codes of the other union republics comprise a group which has—in comparison with the average indicators for other crimes—3-fold more women, 3.5-fold more persons over 50 years old and nearly 4-fold more pensioners.

The courts rarely apply the additional measure of punishment in the form of property confiscation. Frequently they do not assign it even to persistent bootleggers who use home distillation for a parasitical existence. In 1986 it was applied to only 24.7 percent of those convicted nation-wide, and to 27.2 percent in the first half of 1987.

The existing criminal legislation stipulates optional or mandatory application of property confiscation only for the manufacture or storage of home distilled alcoholic beverages (chichi, arrack, mulberry vodka, home-brewed beer and other home-produced alcoholic beverages) as well as of the equipment for their production for the purpose of sale or their actual sale. According to the statistics there are few such persons (4.1 percent) among the total number of those convicted of home alcohol production.

However, the data of the court statistics in this part, it would seem, reflect far from fully the true state of affairs. The study which was carried out provides evidence that the proportion of home distillers who are engaged in the manufacture of illegal alcohol for the purpose of sale or are engaged in selling it is actually significantly higher.

In a majority of instances the preliminary investigation into home alcohol production cases is carried out at a low professional level. In the process, as a rule, a check is not made of whether other people are involved in the manufacture of the illegal alcohol; it is not ascertained whether the specific person against whom the proceedings have been brought for the illegal alcohol production could have—taking into account age, state of health, knowledge and habits, and other circumstances—committed the given crime. In many cases those actually responsible for the organization and implementation of the crime are not brought before the court; instead it is their elderly relatives (frequently women, invalids, and pensioners) who end up on the accused bench taking the entire responsibility for the action upon themselves in order to achieve a reduction in the sentence. In these cases the organ carrying out the preliminary investigation does not always clarify the family situation of the accused (with whom he lives, whether there is a common household); close relatives of the accused and persons living with them are not questioned as witnesses. In a majority of instances these gaps in the preliminary investigation are not filled in by the courts either.

In many cases the preliminary investigation organs and subsequently the courts, when examining cases associated with the manufacture and storage of home-produced alcoholic beverages, as well as equipment to distill them, do not clarify the question of whether the guilty parties were pursuing the goal of selling these drinks or equipment.

It was revealed that in a considerable number of cases, despite the discovery of a large quantity of alcoholic beverages or products of fermentation which had been prepared for processing, the preliminary investigation

organs and the courts—without sufficient grounds—took the word of the bootleggers that they were not intending to sell the beverages.

Point 16 of the 1 November 1985 resolution of the USSR Supreme Court plenum "Concerning the Application by the Courts of Legislation Aimed at Increasing the Struggle Against Drunkenness and Alcoholism" provides a clear explanation of the concept of the "sale" of home-produced vodka and other domestically produced spirits. However, the courts frequently ignore this explanation by the plenum and permit a limited interpretation of the concept. In particular, many courts do not consider that there is a "sale" or "purposes of sale" in those cases in which the bootleggers receive home-produced alcohol instead of monetary reward in payment for the work performed or they manufacture home-produced vodka and other spirits for use for such purposes.

All this results in an incorrect description of the event and consequently the non-application to persistent bootleggers of additional punishment in the form of property confiscation.

Other facts also provide evidence that many persons who are engaged in home distilling for the purposes of sale or in the actual selling of the product remain unpunished.

According to USSR MVD data, proceedings were brought against 29,000 people for the acquisition of home-produced vodka and other domestically produced alcoholic beverages in the RSFSR in the second half of 1986. During the same same time period only 1,973 people were convicted for selling such beverages. During the study of judicial practice in cases of this category, it was discovered that in the first half of 1987 in Voronezh Oblast administrative proceedings were brought against 1,184 people for the acquisition of home-produced alcohol, but criminal proceedings for its manufacture for the purposes of sale or for actual sale were brought against only 98 people; they constitute only a small fraction of the number of established instances of the acquisition of home produced alcohol. These data provide persuasive evidence of the low rate at which persistent bootlegging is discovered, and, consequently, of the lack of punishment for the people who commit these crimes.

Part 3 of Article 158 of the RSFSR Criminal Code permits the application of property confiscation as additional punishment only in those instances in which the

sentence includes basic punishment in the form of deprivation of freedom or corrective work. In addition, in accordance with article 44 of the RSFSR Criminal Code, property confiscation cannot be prescribed when there is a suspended sentence. According to data from the court statistics for the first half of 1987, out of all those convicted under Article 158, part 3 of the RSFSR Criminal Code and the corresponding articles of the criminal codes of the other union republics, 52.1 percent received a fine, and 7.2 percent received a suspended sentence. This means that in fact property confiscation could not be applied to 59.3 percent of those convicted of this crime. At the same time property confiscation as an additional measure was prescribed for only approximately one-third of those for whom it could be prescribed.

The non-application of property confiscation to persons guilty of manufacturing home-produced alcoholic beverages for purposes of sale sometimes depends directly on the court's ill-considered choice of a fine as the basic punishment.

Frequently property confiscation is not prescribed even when its use is required by law; moreover, sometimes this is done without making reference to Article 37 of the Foundations of Criminal Legislation, or without citing in the sentence any reasons for the decision taken.

Out of the total number of people convicted under article 158, part 4 of the RSFSR Criminal Code and the corresponding articles of the criminal codes of the other union republics which call for the mandatory application of additional punishment in the form of property confiscation, this form of punishment was actually prescribed for only 59.5 percent of those convicted in 1986 and 68.6 percent in 1987.

In a resolution adopted 24 December 1987 the plenum of the USSR Supreme Court, having discussed the above-enumerated inadequacies in the implementation of the legislation stipulating the application of property confiscation in cases of home alcohol production, demanded from the courts the elimination of these inadequacies and the strict observation of the law and of the corresponding guiding explanations of the USSR Supreme Court plenum on the application of confiscation as a supplementary punishment measure.

COPYRIGHT: "Sotsialisticheskaya zakonnost", 1988

08543

**Latvia Issues Regulations for Demonstrations, Public Meetings**  
*18000431 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIA in Russian*  
 28 May 88 p 3

[Statute on Rules for Organizing and Conducting Meetings, Public Gatherings, Street Processions and Demonstrations, approved by the Ukase of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium dated May 26, 1988 and signed by LaSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Secretary V. Klibik; Ukase of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on Supplementing the LaSSR Code of Administrative Violations with Amendments and Changes; signed by LaSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Chairman Ya. Vagris and LaSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Secretary V. Klibik, in Riga, on May 26, 1988; Statute's numbered subheads in boldface]

[Text]

**I. General Statutes.**

1. The USSR Constitution and the LaSSR Constitution, expressing the interests of the people and in order to strengthen and develop socialism, guarantee to the citizens the freedom of holding meetings, public gatherings, street processions and demonstrations. The exercise of these political freedoms is ensured by providing public buildings, streets, squares and other public places for the use of citizens and their organizations.

2. The function of the present statute is to facilitate the broadening of the process of democratization, glasnost and exercise of guaranteed civil liberties; the statute sets rules for organizing and conducting meetings, public gatherings, street processions and demonstrations in the public buildings, streets, squares and other public places of the LaSSR.

3. Meetings, public gatherings, street processions and demonstrations should be conducted with full respect for Soviet laws, state and public order, the rights and legitimate interests of citizens, the rules of socialist coexistence and the norms of morality and decency.

**II. Rules for Organizing Meetings, Public Gatherings, Street Processions and Demonstrations.**

4. In order to hold meetings, public gatherings, street processions or demonstrations, representatives of working collectives at enterprises, offices or organizations, cooperatives and other public organizations, grass-roots social organizations or groups of individuals must submit a request to the ispolkom of soviets of people's deputies.

5. The request to conduct meetings, public gatherings, street processions and demonstrations must be submitted to the executive committee of the rayon or city (cities lying within the Republic's jurisdiction) soviet of people's deputies where the event is being held. In the case

of cities divided into rayons, if the event is being held within a single rayon, the request must be submitted to the executive committee of the rayon soviet; if it is being held in two or more rayons, to the executive committee of the city soviet of people's deputies.

6. Requests are not needed for events held by the working collectives of enterprises, offices and organizations, as well as their social associations, in their own buildings and other places, or within the confines of the enterprises, offices and organizations themselves.

7. The request to conduct a meeting, a public gathering, a street procession or a demonstration must be written. It must list:

—the type of event (a meeting, a public gathering, a street procession or a demonstration), its aim, its location, its route, the approximate number of participants, the date and the starting and ending times;

—the names of representatives (organizers) and of those responsible for maintaining order while organizing and conducting the event.

8. No requests to hold a meeting, a public gathering, a street procession or a demonstration will be accepted from citizens younger than 18 years of age.

9. The request must be signed by representatives (organizers), as well as by those responsible for maintaining order while organizing and conducting the event, listing the surname, the first name, the patronymic, the date of birth and the place of residence and work for each person.

The executive committee of the soviet of people's deputies has the right to request from representatives (organizers) whatever additional information is needed to ensure normal conduct of the event.

10. The request must be submitted to the executive committee of the appropriate soviet of people's deputies no later than 15 days prior to the proposed date of the event and must be considered within 5 days of its submission.

11. The executive committee of the soviet of people's deputies must give a written reply to representatives (organizers) notifying them of its decision, create conditions necessary for conducting the event and take steps to ensure public order.

12. The executive committee of the soviet of the people's deputies may change the place, the time and other conditions of holding a meeting, a public gathering, a street procession or a demonstration taking into account the need to ensure public order, normal functioning of enterprises and organizations and the rights and legitimate interests of citizens.

13. The executive committee of the soviet of people's deputies may deny permission to organize meetings, public gatherings, street processions or demonstration if organizing them violates existing laws.

14. The decision of the executive committee of the soviet of people's deputies to deny permission for conducting a meeting, a public gathering, a street procession or a demonstration, or to request changes in the time, the place or other conditions of holding it, must be explained.

15. The decision of the executive committee of the soviet of people's deputies to deny permission for conducting a meeting, a public gathering, a street procession or a demonstration, or to request changes in the conditions of conducting it, may be appealed within 3 days at a higher level executive or legislative body; the latter's decision, which must be reached within 5 days, is final.

### III. Rules for Conducting Meetings, Public Gatherings, Street Processions and Demonstrations.

16. Organizers of a meeting, a public gathering, a street procession or a demonstration must hold it during the set time period and at the set place, pursuing the aims stated in their request; they must maintain order during the event.

17. During the event, its organizers and participants must obey legitimate requests of representatives of the executive committee of the soviet of people's deputies, police and auxiliary police who are responsible for maintaining public order, ensuring adherence to fire safety rules and regulating traffic; they must not litter and must be careful of socialist property and private property of citizens.

18. The meeting, the public gathering, the street procession or the demonstration may be terminated at the request of a representative of the executive committee of the soviet of the people's deputies if violations of this statute occur, if danger to life and well-being of citizens arises, or if public order and normal functioning of enterprises, offices, organizations, public transportation and other services are disrupted.

### IV. Responsibility for Violating Rules for Organizing and Conducting Meetings, Public Gatherings, Street Processions and Demonstrations.

19. Persons violating established rules for organizing or conducting meetings, public gatherings, street processions and demonstrations will be prosecuted according to existing laws.

20. Damage to property belonging to the state, cooperatives, other public organizations and private citizens during meetings, public gatherings, street processions and demonstrations must be compensated as provided by law.

[Signed] LaSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Secretary V. Klibik

**The LaSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium hereby resolves:**

I. Supplement the LaSSR Code of Administrative Violations with the following amendments and changes:

1. Amend the Code with Article 174(3) containing the following words:

"Article 174(3) on Violations of Rules for Conducting Meetings, Public Gatherings, Street Processions and Demonstrations:

Violations of established rules for organizing and conducting meetings, public gatherings, street processions and demonstrations is punishable by a warning or a fine of up to 50 roubles for private citizens, and by a warning or a fine of up to 100 roubles for officials.

2. Amend Article 210, part 1, with number 174(3) after number 174(1).

3. In Article 254, Paragraph 1, after the words "malicious disobedience to a legitimate request or demand of a police officer or an auxiliary policeman" add the words "violations of rules for organizing or conducting meetings, public gatherings, street processions and demonstrations."

II. The present Ukase comes into force on the day of its publication

[Signed] LaSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Chairman Ya. Vagris, LaSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Secretary V. Klibik; Riga, May 26, 1988

12892

### Latvian Plenum Participants Discuss Nationalities Issues

18000422a Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian  
8 May 88 pp 1-3

[LATINFORM Report: "A Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum: To Deepen Democracy and Nurture Patriots"; published from the shorthand record]

[Excerpts]

**A. P. Klaustsen, First Secretary of the Riga Party Gorkom**

In the last 18 months alone the problems of international indoctrination have been considered at meetings of the city party aktiv and plenums of the party raykoms, almost three times a year in each party organization, and

in all labor collectives at gatherings and meetings. It is obvious that this was not only the result of our attention to a very important problem but was most often dictated by objective circumstances.

The reasons for the exacerbation of these issues are explained first and foremost by our inadequate work, the problems that have accumulated in past years, and the desire of the masses to resolve them more quickly, and finally, by the activation of certain forces here among us and abroad, trying to play the so-called "Baltic card."

Perhaps because we in the party gorkom have to deal more often with negative phenomena I have made a more acute assessment of the existing situation.

First of all, the condition of international indoctrination and the tactics in this work. In my view there is no unity here in the assessments of a number of party organizations and on the pages of the press. Voices are heard to the effect that the situation is being overly dramatized by the party committees, particularly the Riga Gorkom. This is what they say: we are for internationalism but there is too much of it; we need less internationalism. This occurs most often because of the fear that internationalization supposedly threatens the development and preservation of national culture. They lose sight of the fact that national traditions become really progressive only when they are enriched with the experience of other peoples.

Notwithstanding, perhaps we in fact are overestimating this danger? For the events of 18 November last year and 25 March this year showed that even in acute moments we have learned to master the situation. But let us be candid: this is achieved by extremely serious efforts. It is impossible not to see that in recent times there has been a certain consolidation of nationalist forces. Attempts have been made on their side to politicize their position with various kinds of manifestoes and petitions in which references are made to perestroyka, glasnost and democratization but in fact are forcing through ardent nationalism.

With their slogans they are striving increasingly to penetrate the youth medium, taking advantage of the acute problems existing in the republic, including the metro. They are trying to exacerbate the situation and sow mistrust between people of different nationalities.

I think that given the different assessments of the situation the departments of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee and its secretariat should assume a more active stance. There must be differing opinion and pluralism, as is now being said. But it seems to me that in matters of principle there should be unified opinion and unified action, for it is from unified opinion that unified action arises.

I want to assert this through further discussion about the mass media. At a meeting of the city party aktiv in October of last year, and before that in the gorkom buro, we sharply criticized individual workers in the party organizations of a number of editorial offices for the publication of materials that served to heat up national feelings on the eve of 14 June and 23 August last year. A number of workers in the editorial offices of RIGAS BALSS were censured by the party.

And what happened? The communists at RIGAS BALSS drew their conclusions. Workers in the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting were offended and remain in that spirit. In short, they have ignored our criticism and our demands. How else is it possible to explain, for example, the fact that on the eve of the well-known events of 25 March this year, in its most popular youth program, Mikrofon-88, Latvian radio offered Lidiya Lasmane-Doronina, three times convicted for anti-Soviet activity and complicity in gangsterism, an opportunity to share her "recollections of the events of 1949"? It is not difficult to guess what kind of recollections she brought to young people, or the feelings that she aroused in them.

Or take another television youth program—"Labvakar." Why was it necessary precisely at this time to talk about the sore points in our history with their obvious implications, and to stir up passions about the Freedom Monument? Was it happenstance that in some radio broadcasts gangsters who bestially killed hundreds of Soviet activists were called "forest brothers" who were not all bad? What is happening is that the party organizations and party and propaganda activists are trying to direct things in one direction but certain workers in the mass media are moving in the opposite direction. The impression is being created that they understand democratization and glasnost and the independence of the mass media as absolutes, outside the sphere of activity of the party and of the organ that they represent. To judge from these facts, the leaders of the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting have removed themselves from leadership over the editorial departments for youth broadcasts, at times are not masters of the situation, and permit errors in personnel selection. The party committee at the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting is displaying lack of principle in assessing the activity of leaders who are communists.

It should be said that at the most recent meetings many communists have expressed similar criticisms against certain republic newspapers.

I would not like those attending this plenum to form the opinion that all the problems of international indoctrination lie outside the sphere of activity by the party gorkom and raykoms. I want to note that in the problems that I have listed much also depends on the party organizations and their fighting spirit and authority. This means that our work is in some way inadequate.

It must be self-critically recognized that in their conduct of mass political work, particularly with all kinds of independent formations, the city's ideological aktiv and the party, trade union and Komsomol organizations are not always achieving their goals.

We are all learning to live and work under the conditions of expanding glasnost, going through a school of democracy again, as it were. But I state candidly that we still do not have the political culture, the ability to hold discussions and respect another viewpoint, and, with the help of the arguments available in our society, to change the mind of an opponent.

In concluding this statement I would like to say to those here attending the plenum that in general the political mood in the city's labor collectives is good and correct, and that communists are preparing to greet the 19th Party Conference in a worthy manner. Discipline in deliveries is improving, plans for the production of consumer goods are being overfulfilled, and the commissioning of housing and other cultural projects is being insured. We are firmly convinced that no difficulties or attempts to hamper our development are capable of holding back the advance or pushing us from the course outlined by the 27th CPSU Congress.

**K.I. Eyzhvertinya, winding equipment operator at the Daugavpils Khimvolokno Production Association imeni Leninskiy Komsomol**

I share the uneasiness of my work comrades in connection with the increased contradictions in relations between the nations within the republic. Many of those here present, of course, remember that these issues were analyzed with special seriousness and resolved during the late Fifties. However, time has shown that the decisions adopted during that period lack any constructive approach or the essential scientific substantiation. This has led ineluctably to errors and exaggerations. Our city is no exception. Thus, in 1961 the republic's oldest professional theater was closed down, and a year later publication of the Latvian-language newspaper PADOMYU DAUGAVA was ended. These ill-considered decisions adversely affected the development of cultural life in Latgaliya and promoted an outflow of the creative intelligentsia from the city.

Life itself has convincingly shown the erroneous nature and overhastiness of some decisions that were made. On behalf of the inhabitants of the city I would like to express my gratitude to the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau for its positive solution to the question of reviving the work of the city theater using Latvian and Russian companies. We understand clearly that we will encounter many difficulties here, first and foremost with training for creative cadres. But the first and most important step has been taken.

Today, successful resolution of problems in relations between the nations depends on specific work at each work place and in each labor collective. A principled discussion of this took place in April of this year at a city plenum of the party organization.

In our city the problem of language knowledge, particularly Latvian, is quite acute. There are shortages of qualified teaching personnel. In Daugavpils only 16 of the 55 Latvian-language teachers have special training. The material-technical base for language laboratories to study the Latvian language does not meet today's requirements. In the new academic year Latvian language training will begin in all preschool establishments for children. But are we ready for this? I think not, and I am not alone in this. Communists have spoken of this with concern at party meetings. A number of proposals have been put forward to provide successful solutions to this problem. It is possible, for example, to recruit Latvian-language teachers for work in children's preschool establishments from among pensioners and the better students at the pedagogical institute. It is possible on the basis of the Latvian language department at our institute to organize courses for more in-depth study of Latvian for teachers in other specialties.

In connection with language study I would also like to address criticism at the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Science and Educational Institutions Department. For in recent times interest in the study of Latvian has been growing sharply. Workers in the department of internal affairs, trade and the services sphere have embarked on a serious study of Latvian. But many problems are still arising on this road. First and foremost there are shortages of methodological materials and textbooks. Is it really impossible to accelerate solutions to these problems?

At the recent meeting between comrade M.S. Gorbachev and representatives of the mass information and propaganda media it was emphasized that the press plays a major role in developing standards in relations between the nations. Correspondents from the republic newspapers rightly criticized us for the shortcomings in formulating visual agitation in the city and for failure to observe the principles of bilingualism. This kind of criticism is useful. But the city's inhabitants regarded as a race for sensation a piece published in the newspaper SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH alleging that an entire palace is being built for workers in the city party apparatus. In fact, it is the city Komsomol committee, which is now located in emergency premises, that is to be housed in the new extension. Then, finally, it will also have its own conference hall in Daugavpils, fitted with equipment for simultaneous interpreting, so essential for our multinational city. I would have thought that a youth newspaper really should have known all this.

Establishing a high standard in dealings between the nations is inconceivable without satisfying the spiritual needs of people of all nationalities living in our republic.

But meanwhile, in the press and in the resolutions adopted the emphasis remains on mutual relations between people of Latvian and Russian nationality. But, for example, the representatives of 54 nationalities live in our city. Many of the city's inhabitants are Belarusians. Taking into account the fact that our contacts are expanding with partners in socialist competition in Novopolotsk, Panevezhis and Tartu, it is planned to open factory outlets in Daugavpils. It has been decided to expand considerably the number of periodicals and books published in the languages of the people living in our city. But here, of course, we shall not manage without help from the State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants and the Book Trade.

The government decision to stop work on construction of the Daugavpils GES and the "Rodnoy Daugave" conference on the republic cultural stock evoked a positive response among peoples of various nationalities in our city. It is not only ecological problems that have become apparent. The city's inhabitants are alarmed by continued use of the base intended for the Daugavpils GES. This must not complicate the ecological problems in the city outskirts.

**Ya.Ya. Peters, Chairman of the Board in the Latvian SSR Union of Writers, poet.**

Today it is already clear that the enemies of glasnost and democratization are celebrating not only a victory. The article "I Cannot Forego My Principles" published in the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA testifies at least to the energetic rebuff that for a majority in society socialism is dearer than their own prosperity. This article clearly showed that two systems have been operating, and will continue to operate, and not only in the economy; the old Stalinist system and the system of stagnation will still repeatedly stand on the road of the course that we initiated with the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and the 27th CPSU Congress. We approach the 19th Party Conference with a heavy legacy—the old mechanism operating both in parallel to and across ideology and other spheres of life. And this is natural: it is impossible to achieve a cardinal change in 3 years. Notwithstanding, the main thing has happened: we have courageously recognized our own desire to save the ethical ideal of socialism which, phoenixlike, must rise again from the ashes. We have started to do what was initiated but not completed by the 20th Congress, namely, insure the elimination of Stalinism as an anti-socialist and anticommunist system, as the result of which there was unanimous, insincere voting, many years during which leaders were not replaced, and a shortage of criticism. As V. Selivanov writes in the newspaper PRAVDA, as a result of this "there was a fusion of a number of workers in the party, soviet and state apparatus with workers in trade, the law enforcement organs and even criminals."

Today we can share the opinion of Fedor Burlatskiy that we have got our ideas about Marxism and Leninism, and

about socialism itself, from Stalinist hands. We recognize that this is so and we shall not judge ourselves and our past or try to learn what we must energetically abandon if we are reluctant to become ridiculous for a year or two.

Two years ago the writer Albert Bel said to me that the process of perestroyka has acquired legs; one leg was the article "Freedom of Choice" by Yu. Burkin published in IZVESTIYA, and the other was V. Selivanov's article "On the Strength and Authority of the Party," published in PRAVDA.

Yes, today we must be ready to continue the revolution that has started. Yes, we must find within ourselves the strength to speak the truth about the mistakes of past years and the crimes, not in order to appear bold but in order to create a theoretical and practical guarantee against the compromise of socialism. How far can our efforts go in the field of democratization? Very far, I think, until "state socialism" becomes "popular socialism," about which people will say: with this system the state and the apparatus are controlled; this system is us, the people of labor, and not a subordinated bureaucracy in which at its sessions the soviet fears its own executive organ, while at their forums the communists fear their own leader. We recognize that soviet power does not operate on all territories and that sometimes it personifies the power only of the chairman of the Soviet's executive organ. Thus, democratization should have no boundaries: democratization is a goal that extends far beyond any frontier. In order for democratization to be successful it must affect the life of the party itself; at all levels the party must be ready to listen to contradictory opinions, even if they contradict the opinion of members of the Politburo or the General Secretary.

In the ideological aspect the Latvian SSR is one of the most complex ethnographic territories. Here we are all equally responsible both for the international interests of our state and for the national interests of Latvia's indigenous population. This is how it is if we consider the matter from Leninist positions. Before this plenum I read a great deal of Lenin—his last letters and articles and his political testament. Even then "war communism" headed by Stalin was laying the foundations for an autocratic resolution of the national question that is palpable even today not only for Latvians but also Russians, whose historical experience Stalinism cynically tried to destroy so that it could caress with one hand while using the other to lay on the whip until that memory was lost, and not a soul remained.

Today, no great effort is needed to understand what must be done from the positions of true internationalism in order to resolve the national question for the good of each people in our country. We must simply return to Lenin, not only in theory but in practice. Remember his words: "It seems that I am very guilty before the workers of Russia for the fact that I did not intervene energetically enough or sharply enough in the notorious question

of autonomy, which, it seems, is officially called the question of the union of the Soviet socialist republics." "...it is essential to preserve and strengthen the union of socialist republics; of this measure there can be no doubt. It is necessary to us, just as a world communist proletariat is necessary for the struggle against the world bourgeoisie and to defend against its intrigues." "...the strictest rules must be drawn up relating to the use of national language in foreign national republics that are part of our Union, and these rules must be checked very carefully. There is no doubt that under the pretext of fiscal unity and so forth, given our present apparatus a mass of abuses of a truly Russian character will penetrate through. Special inventiveness is needed to deal with these abuses, not to mention special sincerity on the part of those who take up this struggle."

Why not propose for consideration at the All-Union Party Conference the question of setting up a State Committee for National Relations similar to the people's commissariat that once existed? Would it not be advisable to publish a newspaper for Latvians living in other republics?

Today Latvia's industry is so hypertrophied that it has acquired a political aspect. This is the direct result of Stalinism and Brezhnevism. Can Gosplan plan the economic development in a particular region of our country without considering the national and ethnosociological features of the area and the vital interests of a specific people? This is what happens: there is a territory where people speak an "economically unsuitable language" but the territory itself is economically suitable. But this is the thinking of the supermagnate who controls and restricts present-day society in the countries of capitalism. If we approach from the positions of profit for "state socialism" then knowing that Belgium and Holland have areas comparable to Latvia, we can locate another 17 million or 18 million people there. This kind of policy will be at variance with the interests of each inhabitant in Latvia, whatever his nationality, and with the interests of the indigenous inhabitants making up the nation.

For planners unaccustomed to independent and competent thinking, both at the center and here, the easiest road is the most advantageous: allocate rubles and resources in the Baltic region where there is already an industrial tradition. But this version is erroneous because it is based on an amoral principle, namely, import the raw materials, entice a work force from other regions, and export the output. Who asked Hammer and his Occidental Petroleum Corporation to make Ventspils "happy" with a plant that no one in West Europe wanted? And what do I love more—the motherland or Gosplan?

A few words about the cultural fund. The metropolitan of Riga and Latvia, Leonid, recently told me that over the past few months the Latvian Orthodox Church has transferred R10,000 into the culture fund. I think that this is much more than our very rich enterprises in

industry and agriculture. Moreover, the Latvian Orthodox Church undeviatingly observes the principle of bilingualism in all its publications.

How long will we watch while Latvia siphons off manpower from Pskov Oblast and Belorussia, leaving deserted villages there? At the writers' congress in Moscow I heard the following question from my colleagues: who is responsible for the devastation of the Russian villages? I did not have the heart to tell them—and Latvia will get the blame. This administrative apparatus should be answerable for the fact that for decades it has been depreciating agriculture, forbidding its development in accordance with the principles of Leninist cooperation.

Each month I receive letters in which Russians and inhabitants of other nationalities offer not me but all of us their help in the matter of improving national relations in the republic. I suggest that the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Commission on National and International Affairs meet the authors of those letters.

#### Ya.P. Britans, editor of the newspaper TSINYA

Today much has been said about the role of the mass media in the cause of perestroika. In fact the force of the printed word in our time is very great. This can be sensed from the increased circulation of the newspapers. In our printing plant even since the beginning of the year about 600 tons of newsprint have been used. There are shortages of publications, which disappear literally during the first minutes after the "Soyuzpechat" kiosks open. The link between readers and editor is growing stronger and there are many letters and telephone calls.

But it must also be said that over the last year I, for example, have received as many rebukes in the editorial office as I did in the preceding 35 years together. Rebukes from all sides, including those that are diametrically opposed. For extremism in work, for being apolitical, for nationalism; while on the other side those rebukes have been for showing the rosy aspects of life and for half-truths. Today there are as many different opinions and assessments in our press as there are readers.

It seems to me that all editorial offices and mass information leaders are in about the same position. This kind of frankness and candid talking is unusual for many broad circles in society. On the other hand, we journalists in the republic—about 1,500 people—have also not fully mastered the new situation. I do think that our journalists have started to work worse; it is simply that now we have to work better. When no subjects are banned and it is possible to talk openly about anything the responsibility of the journalist for what he has written greatly increases. For we still retain our function as the spokesmen of public opinion. A second function is to influence the social processes taking place. And it is

here that we feel that we are still unable to engage in polemic. Like the discussions in the newspapers it is more often than not similar to voting: for or against, without arguing one's opinions.

I would like to say a few words about the Riga metro. TSINYA has received 157 letters on this subject. About a dozen pieces on the subject have been published in the newspaper. I can assure you that we have presented all the arguments that have been put to us by the authors of the letters, and also those participating in roundtable discussions, and we are closing the subject. We have no more conclusions from either side of the argument. We have not expressed our own viewpoint in TSINYA. This is probably why we received so few letters. The published pieces that first expressed themselves "for" or "against" something generated an enormous mail.

I do not think that the discussion on the metro was unnecessary or that it distracted the public from more important matters. At this time we have tried to talk about the most varied problems of perestroyka.

There is one more factor about which I would like to talk today: during the process of democratization and glasnost a group of extremist, nationalistic people has "surfaced." We have not yet said enough about this in the press. I felt this as a member of a Soviet delegation of representatives of the mass media in the United States. In Washington we sat round a table with the leaders of Voice of America, Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe and with representatives of the emigre organizations. We could feel how immediately our interlocutors receive their information from Latvia. Today the Helsinki-86 group has become a unique correspondent's office for the Western services. And as journalists, we are underestimating this fact. The mass media must really speak about every person who stirs up trouble here.

**Col Gen V.I. Grishin, Commander of the Red Banner  
Baltic Military District**

The Military Council and Political Directorate in the district are examining the problem of international indoctrination for personnel as one of the central issues of ideological-indoctrination work. In everyday practical work we are guided by the instructions of V.I. Lenin that there can be no levity in the shaping of relations between the peoples and that vigilance a thousandfold is required in this matter.

The reinforcements entering the ranks of the Armed Forces are people with views, attitudes and convictions already shaped. They are as they were indoctrinated in kindergarten, in the family, at school, in the vocational and technical school and in production, that is, the environment in which they grew up.

Commanders and political workers have enormous experience in international indoctrination work. This experience shows that if youth is indoctrinated in an international collective and studies when at school with others besides Russians—Ukrainians, Belorussians, Uzbeks and Tajiks—service is easier for him. He adapts more rapidly within the collective and finds comrades having common interests, and a friendship springs up between them that does not end when they leave the army. This was seen particularly graphically in the fulfillment of international duty in Afghanistan. This is why commanders are in favor of combined studies and combined military-patriotic gatherings in schools. We are ready to share our own experience with sociologists, schoolteachers and VUZ teachers. But there is still no good contact with them, and our common cause is losing out. The fact that there are cases in which young people fail to report to the draft points is disturbing. Some of them face criminal charges. In some cases questions of indoctrination for draftees and preparation for their service in the army have been poorly resolved in Leningradskiy, Leninskiy, Kirovskiy, Moskovskiy and Proletarskiy rayons in Riga, and in Bauskiy, Rezeknenskiy, Talsinskiy, Liepayskiy, Tukumskiy, Kradlavskiy and Yelgavskiy rayons.

Under the conditions of glasnost and perestroyka, displays of nationalism that were not previously seen have started to come to light among a section of youth in Latvia.

The eminent revolutionary and brother-in-arms to V.I. Lenin, Petr Stuchka, noted that nationalism is a sickness capable of dulling even the most lucid mind. That young people's consciousness can be affected by nationalist attitudes is largely explained by their poor ideological and political tempering. We must give due consideration to the fact that nationalist groups in the Baltic region pay special attention to discrediting the Armed Forces and the prestige of army service.

A second factor that worries us is the ideological baggage and knowledge about the heroic past and attitudes toward it that the sons of Latvia today carry when they come to serve.

Together with the Latvian Komsomol Central Committee, the military commissariat conducted a poll among draftees in autumn of last year, and it became clear that half of them do not watch the program "I Serve the Soviet Union" while many are unable to name the main battles of the Great Patriotic War and do not know when the civil war took place. One in four was unable to name a single hero of the war or the revolution, or of the Latvian riflemen, or a single Latvian military leader. They did not know the names of Fabritius, Zhukov, Rokossovskiy or Alksnis, not to mention today's internationalist heroes.

For more than 40 years we have been living and working under a peaceful sky. Young people should know that 20 million sons and daughters of our multinational country paid for this with their lives.

I receive many letters from the parents of our fighting men, and not only those living in Latvia. I recently received a letter from the Armenian SSR from the widow of a soldier; she had suffered much heartache to understand the need for international brotherhood and friendship and the cohesion of the peoples of the USSR, our multinational motherland. In 1941 she saw off her husband to the front. He died in 1944 in the Lithuanian SSR and was buried in a communal grave. "I am grateful to the fraternal people of Lithuania for their concern and attention to the memorial to those killed for our freedom," the widow writes. "Now my grandson is serving in the ranks of the Soviet Army in the Latvian SSR. I am writing to you to request that he be transferred to somewhere closer to the place where his grandfather, my husband, died. I believe that he will honorably fulfill his service on the land where the blood of his grandfather was spilled.

"My dear sons and valiant defenders of the motherland! May our sky remain peaceful and may the black thunderclouds of war never hang over us. I wish you health and happiness. Defend our country so that the people may live and work in tranquillity."

It seems to me, comrades, that this letter can leave no one indifferent. It contains patriotism and internationalism a hundred times greater than in some newspaper and pieces published on the subject. I have quoted from this letter in order to emphasize the enormous indoctrination potential that the family, the school, the Komsomol and the mass media are failing to use.

I would like to dwell on yet another factor, namely, physical training. When they come to us in the training unit, a number of draftees are unable to chin a horizontal bar and are afraid to go over the obstacle course. How much effort and energy is spent in making them physically strong.

Comrades, we have enormous opportunities to improve patriotic indoctrination. Military units have now been assigned for all schools in Latvia or have assumed patronage over schools. For example, the Riga Higher Military Political School conducts indoctrination work at 14 secondary schools and 6 rural vocational and technical schools, the House of Pioneers, and the secondary boarding school. The Komsomol organization at the school exercises patronage over the memorial to the Red Latvian Riflemen. Thanks to the efforts of teachers and people on the courses, each year military sports days and military-patriotic song contests are held. It has become a tradition to conduct lessons in courage at all training establishments under patronage.

Unfortunately, however, not everything that could be done has been done. First and foremost it is essential to strengthen the ties between people studying on courses at the school and other VUZes in the city in order jointly to conduct various measures and organize resource-and-initiative clubs and sports holidays and involve people on courses more actively in the schools, labor collectives and vocational and technical schools. Thanks to the efforts of course graduates alone, each year it is possible to organize 200 lectures and interviews. In the near future construction of a club will begin at the school. It would be advisable together with the gorispolkom to build an expanded club and make it a center for military-patriotic indoctrination.

We think that the real implementation of all these proposals will significantly strengthen our cooperation in rearing young people who are patriots and internationalists.

**Ya.B. Rantsan, leader of a brigade of fitters and assemblers at the Promtekhmontazh Trust Special Assembly Administration in Riga.**

In my speech I would like to deal with two issues that worry me and my work comrades. The first is the preparations for the plenum. This time, as with the previous central committee plenum, there was an opportunity for familiarization beforehand with the theses of the report. This approach should be continued. And perhaps in the future we should also be familiar ahead of time with the main document—the draft resolution. It is somewhat inconvenient to have to read it during the report and discussion. And it would not be out of place to have an exchange of opinions with work comrades. Second, after listening to the report and the speeches, I concluded the following: we must talk more about those issues that at first blush do not relate directly to ideology but are very acute in life and in the labor collectives and at the same time urgent ideological-political problems.

What I have in mind is the situation with sugar. It has not only troubled us all but has forced us to look at a great deal in a different way. Before the subbotnik many communists and nonparty people were asking the following: how could such a problem arise? I know that not only I but everyone sitting in this hall has one way or another had to respond to this and explain what is happening. For this is a very real political issue.

I have heard the explanations and I have read them: illicit distilling and cooperation. But young people have started to count it up and make their estimates: a terribly large amount of moonshine is being made. Neither was I able to explain why this had happened on the eve of a cause that is sacred to us—the communist subbotnik. Why for 10 to 15 days was the information different? Now it was said that there was enough sugar, and then it was said that there would be ration cards. It is a good thing that we are not tormented by shame. And the same miracles occurred with toothpaste.

And they ask me as a member of the central committee where were the Ministry of Trade, Gosplan, the Council of Ministers and the Central Committee looking? It is not to be believed that no leading worker had been informed about the actual state of affairs or that no one is personally responsible for these outrages. I understand that everyone is busy working on the management structure, but the matter in hand should not suffer! I therefore propose a review of the competence and suitability for their posts of the specific persons to blame for the situation with regard to sugar, toothpaste and other commodities. I believe that the introduction of coupons is the right decision. I also believe that it is essential to find a socially just solution in the distribution of food-stuffs and other consumer goods in short supply. Surely we have specialists who can do this.

I think that the ecological issue can be categorized as an ideological-political issue, and we have spoken too softly about this at the plenum. I am embarrassed by the fact that there is no real objective information that everyone can understand. I really do not know what to do if the summer is a hot one—should I swim in the sea or not? Some say that the journalists and scientists are all exaggerating and that the situation on our beaches is better than on the Black Sea. The television statement by deputy chairman of the Latvian Council of Ministers O.G. Misurkin provided no convincing answer to the question.

I understand that the ecology is the health of our children and grandchildren, the health of all of us and our guests. But as a construction worker I am at a total loss to understand why in Riga for a decade the question of construction of city sewage plants and the question of the cement-and-slate plant have not been finally resolved. I understand that there are problems with capacities and resources, but a choice must be made about construction priorities. I am informed that steps have been taken and that today at the plenum this issue cannot be raised comprehensively; nevertheless, should not the Riga party committee and the Central Committee show an example that is constructive, and stay ahead of events and consider this problem? Perhaps an entire plenum can be devoted to it, but what is really vexing is that the initiative is still in other hands.

**S.V. Zukul, Chairman of the Latvian SSR Committee for State Security**

The party course toward the acceleration of socioeconomic development and the expansion of glasnost and democratization in Soviet society has been perceived with apprehension by ruling circles in the imperialist countries. They are particularly alarmed at the prospects for further significant strengthening of the might and authority of the USSR and the increasing attractiveness of the ideas of socialism.

The intelligence services of the imperialist states are activating subversive operations against the USSR and attempting to place all kinds of difficulties on the road of perestroika. Along with the collection of espionage information the special services are striving secretly to interfere in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union, inspire a campaign about imaginary violations of human rights, and kindle nationalist attitudes and sow national discord.

Under present conditions, one of the spheres of subversive activity against the republic is ideological sabotage, which ruling circles in the imperialist countries, first and foremost the United States, have elevated to the status of state policy. A gamble is being made on kindling nationalism among the population, setting one nationality against another, and overemphasizing particular national features. To this end the so-called "Baltic question," for example, is being strongly exaggerated. In 1987 the U.S. Congress adopted resolutions Nos 300 and 385, which contain recommendations to the President and the U.S. State Department to raise the issue of "the occupation of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by the Soviet Union" and call for the more active use of them against the USSR in international human rights forums.

Guided and funded by the special services, the ringleaders of certain emigre organizations are focusing their efforts on creating an opposition among Soviet people. A definite emphasis is being laid on representatives of the "Helsinki-86" types of groupings, whose negative activity is well known to the public in the republic.

Of course, it should not be thought that all emigres are our enemies. New generations have grown up there and people have begun to hold different views, and positive shifts can be seen that should be developed in the process of cultural, scientific and sports exchanges. On this plane greater opportunities are now being opened up, in the period of perestroika, when increasing numbers of people in the West, including Latvians, are beginning to understand the essential nature of the changes taking place in our country.

The trend toward increased anti-Soviet propaganda aimed at bringing subversive activity directly to the territory of the republic can now be seen with increasing clarity. The displays of nationalism that occurred last year testify to this.

As he gambles on politically and morally unstable persons, the ideological enemy is trying to poison them with the venom of anti-Sovietism and nationalism. Under the influence of hostile actions abroad, in Riga and in the rayons of the republic there are cases of the dissemination of various materials of a nationalistic and slanderous nature. Young people are a particular target of this influence.

It must, however, be recognized that following the great amount of work done by the party organs in the workers' collectives and training establishments, these kinds of negative manifestations have been reduced. This indicates that the course outlined by the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee aimed at strengthening ideological work was correct and—the main thing—all the measures implemented nullified the extensively conceived anti-Soviet provocation of 18 November last year.

Hostile demonstrations in the republic are mainly the result of anti-Soviet propaganda from abroad and of individual nationalistic elements among the republic's inhabitants. But note should also be made of the inadequately high level of teaching in the historical and social sciences in the training establishments, and of international indoctrination in the schools, vocational and technical schools, teknikums and VUZes, and in individual collectives and families, and of some people's incorrect understanding of the process of democratization.

It must also be recognized that within the republic nationalist attitudes are being fanned by the mistakes permitted during the period of the cult of personality and by the inadequately full revelation of Latvia's history.

Throughout past years there has been no decrease in the activity of the enemy's subversive centers of ideological sabotage or of the reactionary circles among emigres, who pursue the goal of destroying the link between the Soviet creative intelligentsia and the broad masses of workers and of alienating it from participation in the building of communism and pushing it onto the path of confrontation with the CPSU and the socialist state.

It is common knowledge that the intelligentsia is doing a great deal to prepare the public awareness to understand the profound and cardinal changes and the process of perestroika that are taking place. At the same time the situation demands clear and authoritative statements from our leading men of literature and from actors, directors and other representatives of the creative forces unmasking the encroachment of nationalist elements on the gains of the Latvian people. To this end we are ready to make available the materials that we have revealing the subversive activity of foreign intelligence services and the antipopular essence of the gangster-nationalist armed underground.

Today internationalism is a set made up of many issues. Undoubtedly the relationship between the national and the international is an issue that is by no means trivial for all generations of Soviet people, for we are linked by a common past, way of life, ideals and common problems now, and by a single destiny in the future. Our ideological enemy cannot come to terms with that.

Anti-Soviets of all sorts, from full-time enemy agents and other agents to the bourgeois emigres, some of whom are traveling to Latvia by various channels, are trying to sow the seeds of national discord, speculating on existing shortcomings and the processes of democratization and glasnost, first and foremost the problems still unresolved in relations between nations in the republic. All this convinces us of the need to take steps to oppose manifestations of nationalism and with all our efforts strengthen the friendship of the peoples and set a high standard in dealings between the nations.

**I.E. Spila, vehicle operator at the Lachplesis Agricultural Firm in Ogrskiy rayon**

I think that the problems of ideology, in particular national questions, depend largely on unresolved economic problems. For example, the question of apartments: if enough apartments were available and people did not have to wait for years in line to obtain housing then no one would have to deal with the issue of whether it is a Russian or a Latvian who gets an apartment, a local inhabitant or someone who has arrived from somewhere else. Then, perhaps, there would not be such extensive discussions about construction of the Riga metro. To a large extent the negative attitude toward the metro is connected with the reluctance about the inflow of manpower from other parts of the country. Some inhabitants believe that this will affect their material well-being and national interests. I believe that the republic leadership should do a better job of explaining these matters. In my opinion it must also provide timely information about the state of affairs with regard to sugar in neighboring republics, and know about the consequences. It has been lack of information that has also led to the creation of queues, causing widespread dissatisfaction among the public.

Were our ideological workers really at their best when republic television screened fragments of the events of 1947 showing the exchange of ration cards and the increases in the amount of food for sale in the stores? Without any explanation of what effective consumer demand was at that time. I would like to ask journalists the following: What was the point of that broadcast? Was it to see after 40 years, today, in the years without war and natural calamities, what a ration card looks like?

People come to me with questions, as a deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet. And it is often difficult to provide any intelligent answer about certain absurd situations. And it starts to appear that some individual difficulties are being created artificially, so as to slow down the process of perestroika and promote dissatisfaction on the part of the people. For example, during the first quarter Ogrskiy rayon fulfilled the state plan for meat purchases 111 percent and produced 380 tons of meat above plan. At the same time only 26 tons were allocated to the rayon from the overall plan. And even these figures are only on paper. The same can be said about milk and egg production.

As a deputy and as a member of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee I have many times heard the promises of the republic leadership that above-plan output will remain at the disposal of the inhabitants of the rayon. Why am I raising this issue? Only because today it is impossible to talk irresponsibly to the people.

This year, in July, we will be marking the centennial of the Lachplesis Firm of A. Pumpura. I hope that this holiday will be a manifestation of the friendship of the peoples, and of cooperation and internationalism. I think that it is precisely from this source that we must promote the development of relations between the peoples. It is essential to respect each other, reinforce the traditions of our own peoples, and fight those who are slowing down the process of perestroika and hampering our advance.

**A.A. Drizul, Vice-President of the Latvian SSR Academy of Sciences.**

Perestroika needs not only democratization in public life and an efficient economy but also the ideology of renewal. This requires from the representatives of all the social sciences the restoration of truth from the standpoint of true party-mindedness and the class approach. History cannot be re-made but it must be assessed anew and it is not only possible but essential to gain a deep understanding of the reasons for and nature of historical events.

For example, questions concerning the dissolution of the groups of *volost* nonparty activists in the spring of 1941, the liquidation of the Workers' Guard in May 1941, the course of the reorganization in the Latvian National Army as a territorial corps of the Workers' and Peasants' Red Army and its history, the reasons for the interruption of mobilization into the Red Army announced on 22 June 1941 in the Latvian SSR, the methods and conduct of collectivization, the extermination battalions in the postwar years, the role of the administrative-command system in distribution of industry and a number of other problems remain unresearched. The *glasnost* that is now being asserted among us is providing us with an opportunity to analyze them.

It is common knowledge that in recent years there have been appeals to publish large print runs of the works of monarchist and bourgeois historians of Russia—Karamzin, Solovyev, Klyuchevskiy. Or the works of Arved Shvade, whose work can be described using the words in the Latvian Biographical Dictionary (1939), where it states that "in his own research he considered and evaluated the past in the spirit of Latvian nationalism." The paradox here is that the forbidden fruit tastes sweet and we must remove the restrictions on these works in the libraries and allow our Soviet readers to read the historians of the past. I am sure that they will be able to discern what is what. But there is another surprising

thing: no voices are heard in the press demanding the republication of early Marxist historical works—M.N. Pokrovskiy and Fritsis Rozin.

The history of the Latvian SSR should occupy a prominent place in the educational process, and for this, by reviewing the training plans it is essential to make it an independent subject of study.

V.I. Lenin constantly pointed to the need to defend the class interests of the proletariat and all workers, and for constant and uncompromising struggle against hostile ideologies. I recall Lenin's proposition here because in the press and on radio and television and in public activity this class principle is becoming diffuse and unclear in evaluation of historical facts. We rightly take pride in the history of the Latvian Riflemen and the Red Riflemen themselves, and many glorious pages have been written in the chronicles of the struggle for victory and to defend the gains of the Great October. However, among us the concept of the Latvian Riflemen as the unified, nonclass pride of the Latvian people is often propagandized. But the Latvian riflemen were also the Red Latvian Riflemen and the Latvian Soviet Rifle Division, and the White Guard Riflemen, the Balodis Brigade, and the Kolchak Imant Regiment. The strength of the Latvian Red Riflemen was led by Bolsheviks. And so why have the words Latvian Bolshevik-Leninist—the pride of our people and of all workers in Soviet Latvia—virtually disappeared from the pages of our press and are not heard on radio and television broadcasts?

Much is now being said and written about the historical memory of the people and about returning to the people the names and works of previously silenced or forgotten cultural and scientific figures, and about restoring the old historical names to many streets and squares in Riga, and all of this is in line with our policy of perestroika, the policy of democracy, openness and *glasnost*. But if when this is done *Sarkanais gvardes* Street—the Red Guard, armed force of the Great October in whose name the memory of the Latvian Red Guards is also immortalized—disappears from the map of Riga, and the street named after Fritsis Rozin, chairman of the first Soviet Government in Latvia, the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies of Latvia, is no longer to be found in Riga, this is bitter to accept. The revolution is an integral part of the people's historical memory. The Red Guard, Fritsis Rozin and 17 June must be reborn on the map of the city in the new housing developments.

Is not the process of affirming the people's historical memory proceeding in a one-sided manner? For voices sound out about renaming *Kommunār* Square as the *Esplanade*. This must not be allowed. *Kommunār* Square was named by a decision of the Soviet Government of Latvia in memory of the 27 communard warriors who fell and were buried there on 14 January 1919. When it came to power the bourgeois government desecrated the remains of the fallen communards, who were

exhumed and secretly re-buried, and the square was made into a military parade ground. We should know and remember this on 14 January 1989, some 70 years later, and hold a state day on Kommunar Square to honor the memory of those fighters for Soviet power in Latvia.

Pieces have appeared in our press about the class struggle in Latvia and the deportations in 1941 and 1949, but we see the old interpretation of the question in them: that supposedly this was the only possible thing to do and was therefore a correct step. At that time the class struggle had assumed most acute forms but many of the innocent suffered, especially women and children. We should not close our eyes to this and say today quite specifically that there was not and could not have been any justification, moral, political, legal or any other, for the crimes of Stalinism. Stalinism and socialism are concepts and categories that are incompatible.

Preparations for the 19th All-Union Party Conference are now under way throughout the party and country. It seems to me that in order to develop party democracy it would be useful to discuss and resolve the following issues at the conference:

—leaders of party committees—the secretaries—should be elected by secret ballot, and likewise at plenums of the party central committee and obkoms, kraykoms, gorkoms and raykoms;

—election of party committees, from central committee to raykoms, should be for a period of 5 years;

—the period in office for elected party and soviet work should be limited to two terms each of 5 years;

—the apparatuses of the CPSU Central Committee and the central committees of the union republic communist parties should be reduced and the party gorkoms and raykoms strengthened;

—a control apparatus should be set up in the country along the lines proposed by Lenin (the Leninist Central Control Commission and Workers' and Peasants' Inspection) and the party control institution be merged with the soviet control institution.

#### R. Ezera, People's Artist of the Latvian SSR

Of course, comparing public life to a river is not very original. Nevertheless, this is the comparison that begs for itself. The years of stagnation remind us of a river in winter. And beneath the ice the river does flow, but the day comes when the ice cover melts and acquires a new quality. The water gushes up, cracks appear in the ice, the river reaches to the banks. The high flood rushes along and the water is turbid and merciless, but it alone can reveal what was hidden beneath the cover. It is not only the poisoned fish but also a great deal of all kinds of filth that floats with the current, consuming us with

horror: how were we able to spend the winter calmly sitting beside all this? It is precisely in the high flood that the river starts to carve a new bed for itself. For Latvians, these stormy processes have meant the cautious word "parkartoshanas". Is it the fault of the translation? Or is it that such a mild term has been born out of our age-old sense of caution? In any event, in Latvian this word sounds much more indeterminate and calm than the Russian word "perestroyka," which also incorporates a factor of disturbance. "Parkartoshanas" on the contrary is perceived as people changing their seats behind the same desk. However, it is a question not of changing places with the same armchairs but of new furniture, a new apartment, a new channel, a new approach and attitude to things. It is a question of purposeful action.

When describing the situation in the field of culture, during his interview with the LATINFORM correspondent comrade A. Gorbunov called it dramatic. I would go further: critical and paradoxical. Enormous treasures have perished as before, and are still perishing, and this in peacetime and under the conditions of socialism. Today we are reaping the fruits of silence and impotence and shortsightedness. We have theaters in a state of emergency, books and museum stock threatened with destruction, architectural monuments that have become ruins, a dirty environment, paintings "serving their time" in cellars, ravaged burial places, and a neglected printing base. For years there have been obstructions around national problems, which can now no longer be resolved merely by studying languages and exchanging cultural values. These problems require a life of intellectual, honest study that is interested in the truth, and also energetic steps to normalize the demographic situation, without which improvement in national relations is impossible. Glasnost is ripping away the cosmetic plaster from social ailments, and the time has come to recognize the ghastly symptoms and urgently treat the patient before we have to stand over his coffin.

No, I do not exaggerate, although I admit that some here present in the hall are exclaiming to themselves: it's just emotion. Today emotion has become for us some kind of newly fashionable swearword. And this frightens me. Where shall we fly if emotion for us is something ridiculous and detested, like that other word, "mercy" was until recently? Without emotion the intellect loses its wings. Perhaps it is in emotion that we have most been lacking up to now. Too much indifference and calculating. Too little emotion and soul. And the fact that our society has now been electrified by both positive and negative charges is typical of today. Without this, striking changes in thought and action are inconceivable.

Our successes in the economy are still modest. Moreover, while groping our way in the new management conditions we permit political errors, sliding down to the already repeatedly mentioned ration coupons for sugar, and that on the eve of a communist subbotnik.

Economics is also ideology, if, of course, we do not consider this old truth to be an empty phrase. It is a question of opportunities for the broad masses, for each person individually to be involved in the processes of life and take part in decisionmaking. To vote for or against something. To speak not in whispers but aloud. To write not anonymously but openly. The fate of the Daugava, the construction of the GES and the plan for the Riga metro have aroused great interest. The condition of the state library and of Riga Castle is cause for alarm. For the first time congresses of the creative unions have taken place with candidness at a high level. Material has been published in the press about the condition of architectural monuments in the republic. Proposals are heard to reallocate assets to the Latvian cultural fund, the noble "Miloserdiye" Society has been set up. Voices are heard in favor of immortalizing the victims of the Stalinist tyranny. These and other things graphically testify to the awakening of the self-awareness of the people and of individuals, the awakening of the conscience. It also testifies to activeness, and a belief in the need for and possibility of positive changes. However, neither self-awareness nor activeness nor faith is capital that can be locked in a safe, convinced that a devaluation of the currency is bound to come. Activeness can be weakened, self-awareness can peter out, faith can dry up.

The past 3 years have been a time for assessing the problems. We have recognized the weak places, the very weak, and the catastrophically weak. Now is the time for urgent action.

And here you cannot accomplish everything through donations from the public and the enthusiasm of those taking part in the subbotnik. As we prepare for the 19th Party Conference is it not time to extend the very concept of enthusiasts in the field of culture, and at all levels, including government? The extraordinary situation typifying the cultural sphere in our republic requires extraordinary measures and additional funding. Money must be allocated for culture. Its profitability is not measured by rubles. We must fight for additional funds now, today, and this requires from the leaders in our republic the most energetic actions, boldness, tenacity, and if need be, risk. It does not promise the quiet life but rather the possibility of reprimands and infarctions more than orders and honorary titles. I therefore emphasize the word enthusiasm, also including in it responsibility, including personal material responsibility, for cultural values. The situation demands from leaders not only political maturity and a high level of professionalism but also a high level of civic and human qualities. In parallel with donations and payments, new opportunities must be sought for obtaining funding. Thus, for example, Ivar Seletskis, who is here today, has proposed taking payments from other film studios to lease Staraya Riga to film movies. Poor Riga has already been subjected to thorough exploitation in films where spies and criminals operate and chases and shoot-outs reign. Why not charge the film studios, say R500 a day, and put the money into a Riga amenity fund. Unusual? Yes, but today much is unusual. And unusual does not mean impossible.

I would like to share my thoughts more closely, and my misgivings about setting up a culture committee. What kind of structure will it have? How many members? What leadership? And has a plan been discussed or at least provision made for discussion? And at what level? My nervous and confused questions may seem naive, perhaps even rhetorical, for it is possible that everything has already been decided behind closed doors somewhere. If this is so then things are looking sad for glasnost. For if the Ministry of Culture, the State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants and the Book Trade and the State Committee for Cinematography are combined and provision has been made to reduce the number of workers there, then the question of the high level of professionalism of each worker and his suitability for what he is doing becomes urgent. I therefore think that leading cadres for the new committee should be selected on a competitive basis from two or even more candidates. The question of each person's suitability should be considered by a commission made up of authoritative representatives of the creative intelligentsia. Again this is unusual. But this does not mean that it is bad. Against the backdrop of reducing staffs, yet another of my ideas may seem just as unusual: in spheres where decisions vitally important for society are made, the staff should include a psychologist. As in the arts, his profitability is not measured in rubles. But today it is still difficult to imagine how many serious errors a talented specialist who knows people well and possesses social intuition could guard against.

Today it is clear as clear can be that each person must as a priority do whatever his immediate task is, corresponding to his profession, duty, calling and ability. There is, therefore, an especially urgent need for a cultural leader, a cultural organizer for whom the honest and skillful safeguarding of culture would be an obligation rather than merely an armchair. I very much hope that we shall not turn back.

**V.O. Miller, Acting Director of the Latvian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy and Law**

Like human rights at one time, national relations in our country have become the avenue along which our ideological enemies are waging, and evidently will wage for a long time their attack against our country. Yes, the situation in the field of relations between the nations has in recent years become very tense. National conflicts previously unknown for us spring up now in one region, now in another, and these are being used by antisocialist forces. Analyzing these conflicts, it can be suggested with a fair degree of confidence that our enemies' main blows will fall here, in the Baltic region. It is precisely here that they will make attempts to shatter and split the Soviet Union. Events that have taken place both last year and this in the Baltic area, and also the reaction to them abroad, testify to this. It is common knowledge that these events did not go unremarked by the U.S. Congress and President Reagan. Complex and still unresolved ecological, food-supply and housing problems are being used to

fan nationalist passions. The ground is being prepared consistently and persistently for new actions aimed at undermining Soviet federative relations.

Are we ready to repulse the attacks? Not quite, I think. What needs to be done? The report offered a program for further activity by the republic party organization. However, particular emphasis should be placed on the need for a more clear-cut political assessment of the events that are taking place and of the importance of unity of views and action by communists in the republic with regard to cardinal questions concerning our development. We must develop a program for action that includes both ideological and indoctrination and ecological and other measures. In my view it is both natural and normal that all the Baltic republics, and first and foremost their party organizations, should really combine their efforts, and in particular make provision for publishing works on questions concerning the history of the Baltic area. Such experience is available. In 1978 the collective work "The Victory of Socialist Revolutions in the Baltic Region" edited by Academician Mints was published. There are other examples.

At the same time it is impossible to blame everything on the intrigues of our enemies in the West. The unresolved problems that have stacked up in national relations must be talked about boldly and candidly. They exist not only in the union republics themselves but in practical work in the decisions concerning federative relations and in

the practical exercise of the rights of the union republics. The time has obviously come to remove the "obstructions" in this field.

For this what is primarily needed is to conduct serious scientific research on the problems existing in relations between the nations. In particular, create within the system of the USSR Academy of Sciences an Institute of Inter-Ethnic Relations or an Institute of the Peoples of the USSR. I hope that this proposal, which has also been put forward by other writers, including Rasul Gamzatov, will receive attention. And in the union republics we could set up departments to study inter-ethnic relations.

In the period of perestroika the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet Council of Nationalities must be organized anew; now it is essentially duplicating the work of the other chamber—the Council of the Union—and for a long time has not been fully resolving the tasks that were assigned to it when it was organized, namely, to reflect the specific national interests of the peoples of the USSR. At the same time it is essential to expand real participation by the union republics in the resolution of all-union tasks through their more active and effective participation in the work of the union republic committees and the ministries and departments. And the main thing is to review the competence of the union and the union republics so that the latter would enjoy more realistic rights in resolving questions concerning the development of their own national economies and would be free from the numerous concords.

09642

**END OF  
FICHE**

**DATE FILMED**

19, Aug. 1988